

By Mr. DYER: Petition of employees, customhouse, St. Louis, Mo., urging amendment to appropriation bill providing for increase for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Cleveland conference board of International Molders' Union, urging a universal eight-hour day; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry farmers of Grundy County, Ill., against the importation, duty free, of corn from Argentina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Bronx memorial committee, United Spanish War Veterans, New York, favoring House bill 15145, providing employment by the United States of discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Navy Yard Retirement Association, navy yard, New York, urging passage of House bill 12352 and Senate bill 4637, known as Keating-McKellar retirement bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Trenton, N. J., favoring the enactment by Congress of some law which will continue the control and operation of the wire systems by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be followed when they are returned to their private owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hamilton Grange, No. 79, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hamilton, N. J., urging State and National Governments to appoint a representative farmer on all committees and commissions when the interest of the farmers are concerned; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hamilton Grange, No. 79, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hamilton Square, N. J., calling upon our National Government to conduct a campaign of education which will give facts respecting the true cost of production to the people; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mr. W. L. Cooper, and 21 other members, of Trenton local union No. 102, Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen of America, urging Government control and operation of the railways of the United States for a period of five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, urging legislation providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Williamsport Merchants' Association, of Williamsport, Pa., relating to Government control of the telephone and telegraph system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of Williamsport, protesting against Government ownership of telephone and telegraph companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of New England Nurserymen's Association, Boston, Mass., opposing quarantine order No. 37 as contrary to the Federal plant-quarantine act of August 20, 1912; to the committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Socialist Party of Connecticut, asking that necessary steps be taken by United States to recognize the Russian Soviet Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of Warren Grange, No. 536, Patrons of Husbandry, Warren, Oreg., relating to control of railroad rates and urging their restoration to the Oregon Public Service Commission, also recommending restoration of railroads of this country to owners at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of local board for division No. 2, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging legislation for the deportation of aliens who have taken advantage of alienage to avoid military service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also petition of Monongahela Council, No. 491, Knights of Columbus, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that Ireland be permitted to determine for itself the form of government under which it wishes to live; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of California Real Estate Association, indorsing appropriation of \$100,000,000 for reclamation of lands for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers of America, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring continued operation of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Friday Morning Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 100 citizens of Kenton and Campbell Counties, Ky., asking for Government ownership of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of city council, Chicago, Ill., urging payment of six months' compensation to all discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, asking favorable consideration of the claims of Ireland for self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, favoring Government ownership and control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Council of Jewish Women of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation creating national department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Nottaway County, Va., in favor of the Government ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prottymann, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee reverently, in the spirit of worship. We recognize Thy goodness, and put ourselves under Thy guidance. We are facing the great problems of life, not only the problems that must yield to human reason but those deeper problems that lie in the hand of God, and that can be reached and solved only as Thou dost lead us. We pray Thee to save us from error of judgment, from conceit of ignorance and pride, and give us that yielding spirit to the divine will that we may write into the laws of this Nation the will of God and establish our institutions upon the divine plan. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1919, when, on request of Mr. ASHURST and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Norris	Smoot
Baird	Hardwick	Nugent	Spencer
Bankhead	Henderson	Page	Sterling
Beckham	Hitchcock	Pittman	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	Poindeexter	Thomas
Calder	Kellogg	Pollock	Thompson
Culberson	Kendrick	Pomerene	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Ransdell	Trammell
Curtis	Kirby	Reed	Underwood
Dillingham	Knox	Robinson	Vardaman
Fernald	La Follette	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCumber	Shafroth	Walsh
France	McKellar	Sheppard	Warren
Gay	McLean	Sherman	Watson
Gore	McNary	Shields	Weeks
Gronna	Moses	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Hale	New	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

COST OF THE WAR (S. DOC. NO. 397).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a report relative to the actual and estimated expenditures made on account of the war, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of the Treasury (S. Doc. No. 400) and the Secretary of the Navy (S. Doc. No. 398), transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, lists showing the num-

ber of civilian employees in their department on February 1 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of War (S. Doc. No. 401), the Secretary of Agriculture (S. Doc. No. 399), the Attorney General (S. Doc. No. 406), the Secretary of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 403), the Postmaster General (S. Doc. No. 407), the Secretary of Labor (S. Doc. No. 405), the Director of the War Trade Board (S. Doc. No. 404), and the Chairman of the United States Shipping Board (S. Doc. No. 402), transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, 1918, lists showing the number of civilian employees in their respective departments on February 12 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CLAIMS OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, supplemental to his letter of February 7, 1919, a list of items for the relief of officers and for the settlement of certain claims, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PRODUCTION OF POTASH (S. DOC. NO. 396).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, certain information relative to the consumption of potash in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

AGENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN MICHIGAN (S. DOC. NO. 395).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, certain information relative to the activities of agents of the Department of Justice in investigating alleged violations of the Federal statutes in the State of Michigan, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COLUMBIAN DRY DOCK CO. (S. DOC. NO. 394).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, certifying that the case of the Columbian Dry Dock Co., of Baltimore, Md. against the United States, transmitted to the Court of Claims by resolution of the Senate, June 2, 1900, under the act of March 3, 1887, was dismissed by the court December 16, 1918, for want of jurisdiction, on motion of the defendants, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5279) to authorize the resumption of voluntary enlistment in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3797) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1918, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14555. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Barrs Ferry, in said county; and

H. R. 15495. An act to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the immediate formulation of rules and regulations governing demobilization of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 7, with

the original copy of said senate joint memorial No. 7 now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol, at Olympia, this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,
Secretary of State.
By J. GRANT HINKE,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Secretary of War:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, would most respectfully represent and memorialize your honorable body and the Secretary of War as follows:

That rules and regulations governing demobilization should favor the immediate release of those who are needed in business and industrial pursuits and defer the release of men without present opportunities for employment.

Wherefore your memorialists pray that your honorable body and the Secretary of War, at the earliest possible moment, formulate rules and regulations governing the demobilization, as herein indicated.

Passed the senate January 31, 1919.

LOUIS F. HART, President.

Passed the house February 5, 1919.

FRED A. ADAMS, Speaker.

Indorsed: State of Washington, ss. Filed in the office of secretary of state February 10, 1919. I. M. Howell, secretary of state.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Paragould, Ark., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. STERLING. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the purchase of the wheat crop of 1919. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be read at the desk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

[Sixteenth session Legislative Assembly State of South Dakota.]

Senate concurrent resolution, introduced by the joint committee on agriculture.

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the purchase of the wheat crop of 1919 and to confer upon the President of the United States full power and authority for the handling of the same.

Whereas the price of all wheat to be produced in the United States in the year 1919 has been fixed by the President of the United States by authority of Congress, which act is of great importance to the farmers of all wheat-producing sections of the country, causing as it has the planting of a large acreage of winter wheat and the plowing and otherwise preparing for the sowing to wheat of a large acreage in the States raising spring wheat, which, owing to the high cost of labor and other factors entering into such enterprise, has required a much larger investment than for any preceding crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in regular session assembled does earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such congressional action as may be necessary to empower the President of the United States to fulfill the contract entered into with the farmers of the United States, so that they may receive the full benefit of the price fixed for the wheat crop of 1919 without unnecessary delay, and that the Government of the United States may purchase all wheat offered it, thereby removing any danger of wheat speculators depressing prices during the period when the greater portion of the wheat crop is being placed upon the market, and enabling the Government of the United States to hold full and absolute control of the situation, to minimize the loss, if any, which might possibly otherwise occur, and to fix if deemed wise the price of flour to the consumer on a parity with that of other food products; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies hereof be mailed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. I also present two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of South Dakota, one relating to the change of the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal, and the other memorializing Congress to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading and appropriately referred.

The memorials were referred, respectively, to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals and to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. Burkhart, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed resolution, to wit, a concurrent resolution, was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, February 12, 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

Whereas our Nation suffered a sense of bereavement personal to every American when the Maker of men recalled the intrepid soul of Theodore Roosevelt, the most virile, most brilliant, best beloved, and most typical American of his time, whose accomplishments as athlete, plainsman, soldier, author, explorer, President, and apostle of undiluted Americanism have made him a figure to touch and inspire the imagination of youth for generations; and

Whereas one of his many great achievements is represented by the canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans which his constructive and practical genius, brushing aside the bickerings, debates, and delays of 50 years, made possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress be petitioned officially to designate that American-made waterway the Roosevelt Canal, so that the same shall stand in name, as well as in historical fact, an enduring monument to his greatness, a constant reminder that the canal is, like the great President who started it, unqualifiedly American; and

Resolved further, That copy of this resolution, duly attested by the signatures of the presiding officers and chief clerks of the two houses, shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

For the senate.

W. H. McMASTER, President.
A. B. BLAKE, Secretary.

For the house.

LEWIS BENSON, Speaker.
WRIGHT TARBELL, Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. Burkhardt, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed resolution, to wit, a concurrent resolution, was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, February 12, 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes.

Whereas the Dominion of Canada has provided for the improvement of the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, so that such canal will accommodate ships of 25-foot draft, 800-foot length, and 80-foot width, work on which improvement was suspended during the war and is now again being taken up and will be completed in the near future; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario can not be used by vessels of over 14-foot draft and 270-foot length; and

Whereas it is deemed to be a matter of great and vital importance to the United States that the St. Lawrence River be so improved that larger vessels may be accommodated and may move between the Great Lakes and the ocean: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be deemed best and most expeditious looking to the early improvement of the St. Lawrence River by joint arrangement with the Dominion of Canada.

Resolved further, That copy of this resolution, duly attested by the signatures of the presiding officers and chief clerk of the two houses, shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

For the senate:

W. H. McMASTER, President.
A. B. BLAKE, Secretary.

For the house:

LEWIS BENSON, Speaker.
WRIGHT TARBELL, Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present resolutions from Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, asking that the United States shall intercede for the freedom and independence of Ireland. I ask that the memorial, which is very short, shall be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regular meeting of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, held this 9th day of February, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas this Nation was the founder of and to-day is the chosen champion of true democracy;

Whereas all nations, no matter how small or insignificant, are by inherent right entitled to rights of self-determination;

Whereas our chosen representative, President Woodrow Wilson, voicing the sentiment of the people, has time and time again openly pledged the allegiance of this country to the principle that no country shall govern without the consent of the governed;

Whereas no nation so small, or for such a long period of time, has suffered as much because of its love of freedom as Ireland;

Whereas the manhood of these glorious United States is now returning from the war they waged on a foreign soil in behalf of this same principle of the rights of small nations;

Whereas this Nation, enjoying all the privileges of a well-organized democracy, has always been on as friendly terms with Ireland as with the other European nations in whose behalf we took up the sword;

Let us be accused by our enemies of inconsistency and hypocrisy; Be it further

Resolved, That Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, being associated with the Federation of Friends of Irish Freedom, is of the unanimous opinion that this Nation should, and by unanimous vote of its members asks that this Nation do, intercede in the behalf of Irish freedom and independence; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators, the Hon. A. B. CUMMINS and the Hon. W. S. KENYON; our Representative in Congress, C. C. DOWELL; also that copies be furnished to the press of the city of Des Moines, Iowa, for publication.

JOHN P. O'MALLEY,
J. P. MURPHY,
M. T. SCANLON,
JAMES E. O'MEARA,
R. F. KELLEY,
JOHN CONNALLY, Jr.

Mr. CUMMINS. I also present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa in regard to uniforms for soldiers, which I ask be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from Iowa in the Congress at Washington, D. C., be requested and urged to support the proper measures allowing all soldiers and sailors, discharged or to be discharged from the Army or Navy of the United States, to retain the clothing furnished them by the Government; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the United States Senators and Representatives from Iowa.

ARCH. W. MCFARLANE,
Speaker of the House.
W. H. HONEY,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

I hereby certify that this resolution was introduced in the House on January 15, 1919, was taken up by unanimous consent, and adopted, and that it was concurred in by the Senate on January 28.

W. C. RAMSAY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa in regard to the solution of the railroad problems, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas postwar and reconstruction conditions have brought the United States of America many problems of great import, and perhaps the one of greatest importance is the question of Government ownership of the railways of the United States; and

Whereas our President, in his address to Congress on December 2, 1918, said: "The question which causes me the greatest concern is the question of the policy to be adopted toward the railroads. I frankly turn to your counsel upon it"; and after making other statements on this subject, further says: "Let me say at once that I have no answer ready. The only thing that is perfectly clear to me is that it is not fair either to the public or to the owners of the railroads to leave the question unanswered, and that it will presently become my duty to relinquish control of the roads, even before the expiration of the statutory period, unless there shall appear some clear prospect in the meantime of a legislative solution. Their release would at least produce one element of its solution, viz, certainty and a quick stimulation of private initiative"; and

Whereas our President has turned to Congress for counsel on this momentous subject, in his keen sense of justice endeavoring to deal fairly with the owners of the railroads and protectively to the public welfare; and

Whereas we feel that the Congress of the United States will, by being informed of public sentiment, be better able to solve and direct the course of the problem, and recognizing the necessity, as expressed in the President's address, of relinquishing control of the railroads as quickly as possible, and the certainty of conditions that said release of the railroads by the Federal Government would immediately establish: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring) of the thirty-eighth general assembly, That we favor the return of the railroads to their owners as soon as it can be accomplished without confusion or losses; be it further

Resolved, That we believe and think private ownership under strong Government control and regulation, in service, income, and disbursement is desirable, and we do not believe Federal Government ownership of railroads is for the best interest of the people at this time; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate and the chief clerk of house forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from Iowa for their consideration.

ARCH. W. MCFARLANE,
Speaker of the House.
PRINCE R. MOORE,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this resolution was introduced in the house on February 1, 1919, was adopted on February 3, and was concurred in by the senate on February 11.

W. C. RAMSAY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I have two resolutions the same in language as to the heading and the signing, one passed by the State Senate of Nebraska and the other by the house of representatives of that State, in relation to an order issued by the Secretary of War. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolutions are as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the Senate, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln, this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 5, 1919.

HON. D. M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State, Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by the State senate under this date and is hereby transmitted to you:

"Whereas press reports state that several hundred men who were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country, or support thereof, are to be given and are being given honorable discharge from the Army, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing, and paid the full wage, and in some instances fifteen to twenty-five dollars more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and

"Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life; loyal and unselfish men who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government, and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country, and who by their glorious achievements have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war; and we call upon the Congress of the United States to condemn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism; and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds: Be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of Congress and the Senators from this State."

I, Clyde H. Barnard, secretary of the Senate of Nebraska, hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, complete, and verified copy of resolution adopted by the senate February 5, 1919.

CLYDE H. BARNARD,
Secretary State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

D. M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.
W. L. GASTON,
Deputy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF CHIEF CLERK,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 6, 1919.

Whereas press reports state that several hundred men, known as conscientious objectors, were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country or support thereof, are to be given honorable discharge from the disciplinary barracks, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing, and paid the full wage, and in some instances \$15 to \$25 more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life; loyal and unselfish men, who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country, and who by their glorious achievements have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war; and we call upon the Congress of the United States to con-

demn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism; and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds. Be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of the Congress and the Senators from this State.

D. S. DALBEY, Speaker.
WILL F. HITCHCOCK,
Chief Clerk.
DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. HENDERSON. I present a petition signed by many citizens of Nevada in favor of the national ownership and Government operation of all the railroads of the country, which I move be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENDRICK. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The memorial is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled joint memorial No. 1, Senate, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original senate joint memorial No. 1, has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office on the 14th day of February, A. D. 1919, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming. Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 13th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State.
By H. M. SYMONS,
Deputy.

Senate joint memorial 1.

Whereas the State has begun the construction of a comprehensive system of highways, which are essential to the development of the State; and

Whereas the vast distances within our State which must be covered by improved highways and because our present population of only 200,000 people preclude the possibility of completing this task within the next generation, if the funds are to be derived from direct taxation and such Federal aid now available; and

Whereas more than 50 per cent of the total area of Wyoming is still in the public domain, while less than 18 per cent of this area has been patented to our citizens and over 17 per cent has already been set aside as national reserve; and

Whereas our highways must necessarily be built over large areas of public lands, thus greatly enhancing their value, though there is no way to assess a proportionate share of the cost of such construction against these lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress be requested to set aside 2,000,000 acres of public lands in the State of Wyoming, to be known and designated as State lands, to be selected, appraised, and sold or leased by the State, and the proceeds to be used in the construction of State highways; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to each of the Members of the congressional delegation from the State in Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the request that they employ their best efforts to secure favorable action from Congress along the lines indicated.

T. G. POWERS,
President of the Senate.
E. J. SULLIVAN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved:

ROBERT D. CAREY,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 14, 1919—3.30 p. m.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin relating to the establishment of a league of nations. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) relating to the establishment of a league of nations.

Whereas the war, now brought to a victorious close by the associated power of the free nations of the world, was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That we favor the establishment of a league of nations, of which the United States shall be a member. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world; that it should clinch the victory won at such terrible sacrifice by having the united potential force of all its members as a standing protection for the world against any nation that seeks to upset the peace of the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution properly attested by the presiding officers be sent to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. G. SHAFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to the construction of a

military highway connecting Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, and Fort Bliss, in the State of Kansas, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Kansas (both houses concurring therein)—

Whereas the great war has demonstrated the necessity of good roads for military efficiency; and

Whereas the Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, Fort Bliss National Military Highway Association, representing the States of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Kansas, meeting at Hutchinson, Kans., on Monday, January 20, 1919, has prepared a satisfactory route for such a highway, connecting the three great military posts of the Middle West, Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, and Fort Bliss, and has effected a strong and effective organization to carry out the said project, and has taken the preliminary steps to memorialize Congress in its favor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request our Senators and Representatives to use every effort to secure the necessary appropriations, either by special bill or as a part of the military appropriations, for the construction of the highway approved by the said association as a military highway to be built and maintained by the Federal Government, open, however, to civilian traffic under such rules and regulations as the War Department may impose.

CHAS. S. HOFFMAN,
Lieutenant Governor.
E. D. GEORGE,
Secretary.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Salina, Kans., and a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Concordia, Kans., favoring the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Wichita, Kans., favoring the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Parsons, Labette, and Goodland, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the United Trades and Labor Council of Pittsburg, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Sumner County, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, express, telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., and a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 555, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Arkansas City, Kans., favoring the proposed restriction on immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Council No. 90, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the adoption of an eight-hour work day and for increased compensation for overtime work, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 32, Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America, of Republic County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation guaranteeing the minimum price of \$2.20 per bushel for the 1919 wheat crop, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Education of Lawrence, Kans., remonstrating against the honorable discharge of conscientious objectors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Stringtown Grange No. 1489, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burlington, Kans., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Education of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Kansas City, Kans., favoring the granting of six months' additional pay to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 555, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Arkansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the supreme peace council making any effort to regulate labor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association of Manhattan, Kans., praying for an increase in

the salaries of veterinary inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Lew Gove Post No. 100, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Manhattan, Kans., remonstrating against the transferring to the War Department of Battle Mountain Sanitarium, of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Commercial Club of Sheridan, the Commercial Club of Buffalo, and the Merchants' Credit Association of Cody, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13482) creating a commission for the maintenance, control, care, etc., of the Perry's victory memorial on Put in Bay Island, Lake Erie, Ohio, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 222) extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5313) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate \$500,000 therefor, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 731) thereon.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4729) to exclude certain lands from the Pike National Forest Reservation, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 734) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3964) for the relief of Otis C. Mooney, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 733) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15706) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 735) thereon.

JENNIE M. HEATH.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10225) striking from the pension roll the name of Jennie M. Heath, and I submit a report (No. 730) thereon. It is a bill reducing the pension roll instead of increasing it, and if there be no objection I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike from the pension roll the name of Jennie M. Heath, helpless and dependent child of Charles E. Heath, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, who is now pensioned by special act of Congress approved August 7, 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Montana explain the reason for this action?

Mr. WALSH. The name was put upon the pension roll by mistake.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4246) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut shall be at the rate of \$4,500 a year.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Record the House report upon the bill increasing the salary of the district attorney of Connecticut which the Senate passed early in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request of the Senator from Connecticut is granted.

The report is as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4246) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, having had the same under consideration, unanimously recommend that the bill do pass, with the following amendment:

On line 5, after the word "of," strike out "\$5,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$4,500."

The State of Connecticut comprises one judicial district with a population of 1,114,756, as of 1910, and the law provides for the holding of court at New Haven and Hartford. The present salary of the United States attorney for this district is \$2,500. The population of the district has increased more than 600,000 since the salary was fixed at \$2,500, and your committee believe that at present it is wholly inadequate.

The present incumbent states that between March 1, 1917, and March 15, 1918, there were 253 criminal cases begun and 236 cases closed, and 28 civil cases begun and 11 closed, while during the same period there were approximately 100 complaints made which never developed in cases.

The population of the different other New England States and the salaries paid the United States attorneys therein follow:

Maine, 742,371; salary, \$3,000.
New Hampshire, 430,572; salary, \$2,000.
Vermont, 355,956; salary, \$3,000.
Massachusetts, 3,366,416; salary, \$5,000.
Rhode Island, 542,610; salary, \$2,500.

In the first session of the Sixty-third Congress a bill (S. 281) passed the United States Senate approving an increase in the salary of the United States attorney for Connecticut to \$4,000, and that was before the large amount of extra work entailed by the war was added to the routine of the office. On account of the outbreak of the European conflict at that time, the House took no action, as the policy adopted at the period was that no more bills for increases in salaries should be considered.

The clerk of the court receives about \$6,000 a year. The internal-revenue officer for the district receives \$4,500 a year. The postmaster at Hartford receives \$6,000 a year. The salary of the collector of customs for Connecticut is \$5,000 a year.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on Rules I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 339, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], to amend Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding thereto a paragraph restricting and regulating membership of certain committees of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 732) thereon. I ask that the report of the committee be printed in the Record. I make this request because at the first convenient time after to-morrow I intend to ask for the consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration Senate resolution No. 339, recommends the adoption thereof with the following amendment: Strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive, and substitute therefor the following:

"Beginning with the first session of the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress no Senator shall be a member of more than two of the following standing committees of the Senate, namely, Appropriations, Agriculture and Forestry, Commerce, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate Commerce, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Post Offices and Post Roads. No Senator being chairman of either of the committees named in this paragraph shall be appointed on a conference committee upon any bill reported by either of the last-named standing committees unless it is reported by the committee of which he is the chairman."

The purpose of the proposed amendment to the rules is, in the judgment of this committee, commendable, and it is believed that the results of its adoption will be salutary. The object sought to be obtained in restricting the assignment of Members of the Senate to places upon the 10 chief standing committees is to secure a proper distribution of the work of the Senate among its Members, and thereby not only facilitate the disposition of the public business, but to insure a more careful consideration of the bills which are referred to these committees.

With respect to the limitation upon appointments upon conference committees, it is hoped that there will be accomplished a more equitable division of the responsibilities of legislation; a division that will have a tendency, at least, to give all the Members of the Senate an incentive to fit themselves for the important labors which fall upon conference committees.

It may not be amiss to say that the action of the Committee on Rules was unanimous.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13369) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Connecticut River between Springfield and West Springfield, in Hampden County, Mass., and I ask that it be considered at the present time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Texas if he will not wait until morning business has been

finished and then ask for the consideration of the bill? The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has consented to wait until then, as there is considerable morning business that ought to be attended to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the report for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report is withdrawn.

LOAN OF AIRCRAFT MOTORS.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 205) permitting the loan of aircraft motors and aircraft material to educational institutions under certain conditions.

I will say that the consideration of this joint resolution will not require a moment's discussion. The facts are simply these: Two or three educational institutions, among them the College of the City of New York, have requested of the War Department the loan of Liberty motors for the use of students of those colleges. The War Department is perfectly willing to make the loan, but lacks the authority to do so. This joint resolution simply confers authority upon the War Department to make such loans at its own discretion, reserving to the Government the title to the motors and all other material.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, do I understand the joint resolution applies to certain specified colleges, or is it a general law that applies to all colleges which are similarly situated?

Mr. NEW. The joint resolution is general in its application, so that such loans may be made to any college that wants them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the joint resolution ought to be read. I should like to know its terms.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "loan," to strike out "to bona fide educational institutions in the United States aircraft motors and aircraft equipment in such instance as in the judgment of the Secretary of War beneficial educational purposes can be served by such loan," and to insert "aircraft motors and aircraft equipment to such educational institutions in the United States as provide advanced mechanical and technical instruction, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe," so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered, for the purpose of aiding, fostering, and promoting educational experimentation work, to loan aircraft motors and aircraft equipment to such educational institutions in the United States as provide advanced mechanical and technical instruction, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not defer that request until we get through with morning business? We have not had a morning hour for a long time. There are bills and resolutions to be introduced, and it seems to me that the Senator should wait until we get through with the formal morning business.

Mr. PITTMAN. I recognize that there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, and it was my intention to wait until the morning business had been concluded before moving to take up this matter, as I gave notice yesterday that I should do; but there are so many bills now being passed by unanimous consent—

Mr. NORRIS. There has been only one such bill, and I think with this statement there should be no more requests for unanimous consent to pass bills during the morning hour, and the Senator's request should be deferred also.

Mr. PITTMAN. Of course, I defer to the pleasure of the Senate in the matter. I withdraw the request.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall object to any other bill being considered at this time.

DISCHARGED SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice that during the morning hour to-day I would ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported by me from the

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, being House bill 13026, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors. The passage of the bill is absolutely vital if we are to provide for the discharge of disabled soldiers of the United States. I desire to say that I intend to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill as soon as we get through with morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Bills and joint resolutions are in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE (by request):

A bill (S. 5636) providing for the enactment of a credit-union law in the District of Columbia by which the officers of such credit union shall be empowered to receive deposits from and make loans to the stockholders thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 5637) granting an increase of pension to George Montgomery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 5638) to provide for election contests in the Senate of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5639) to establish and promote civic, social, and health extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 5640) donating captured cannon to the towns of Coeur d'Alene, Sandpoint, and Gooding, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5641) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, on October 10, 1918, I introduced a bill to create a department of education, which is Senate bill 4987. I have modified that bill somewhat and I desire to introduce it anew to-day and have it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 5635) to create a department of education, to appropriate money for the conduct of said department, to appropriate money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In connection with introducing the new bill I wish to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4987, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. KNOX submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint Col. George K. McGunnegle, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general, on the retired list, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California submitted an amendment providing that the transportation from the District of Columbia of governmental employees whose services are no longer required or who may resign from their positions, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NITRATE PLANT AT SHEFFIELD, ALA.

Mr. GORE. I offer a Senate resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for just a moment? On account of an important meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am compelled to leave the Senate, and I have a Senate resolution which I desire to offer and to have read before I leave the Chamber.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit a Senate resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution (S. Res. 459) was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to make an investigation and report to the Senate its findings of fact upon the following:

First. What inducement, if any, did the War Department offer to officers and enlisted men in investigating and making improvements in the method of extracting nitrogen from the air in the United States Nitrate Plant No. 1 at Sheffield, Ala.?

Second. What improvement, if any, in such process was invented by Capt. R. S. Tour and Second Lieut. F. C. Binnall?

Third. Was any such improvement discovered by the said Capt. Tour and said Second Lieut. Binnall patentable under the laws of the United States?

Fourth. If any such process so discovered was patentable, were the said Capt. Tour and said Second Lieut. Binnall required by any official of the War Department, by coercion or otherwise against their will, to assign such patentable rights to the General Chemical Co.?

FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR.

Mr. GORE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 458) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate as to the comparative freight rates on wheat and on wheat flour, and if there be a differential to state the same and cite typical cases.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer an amendment to Senate resolution 411, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], requesting that our soldiers be withdrawn from Russia. As that subject has been discussed and the amendment is pertinent, I will ask that the Secretary read it, and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amend Senate resolution 411 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Whereas by a revolution in Russia in the month of March, 1917, the government of that country was wrested from its autocratic rulers and the people proceeded to establish a representative form of government and duly elected a congress to administer its affairs; and

"Whereas through the instrumentality of a German propaganda and by intrigue and bribery a counter-revolution was inaugurated which overthrew the government so established by the Russian people and abolished and dispersed their representative body; and

"Whereas through the basest treachery and at the most perilous period in the history of the war their criminal element controlling the destinies of Russia abandoned the cause of the allies, betrayed their comrades in war and their country, and made their country subservient to the demands of the central powers, thereby enabling those powers to withdraw all their armies from the east and use them in a final blow on the western front to destroy the cause of Russia and her allies; and

"Whereas Lenin and Trotzky and other so-called officers of the Bolshevik element now devastating Russia are not only our enemies but, worse than enemies, are traitors to the cause of liberty and civilization; and

"Whereas the atrocities committed by them are manifold greater than all the atrocities charged against the invading German armies or committed by the Turkish armies in Armenia; and

"Whereas the President of the United States pledged the good offices and support of this Government to assist the Russian people in establishing a representative government, and assured, as one of the 14 articles of peace conditions, the cooperation of this and other allied nations in obtaining for Russia an unhampered and unbiased opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development, and agreed to extend to her the more than welcome assistance of every kind that she might need; and

"Whereas the vast majority of the Russian people are bitterly opposed to the Bolshevik rule, with all its atrocities, but are unorganized and unable to maintain their rights; and

"Whereas if the Bolshevik criminals now in control of that unhappy country are allowed to continue their robberies and murders and to annihilate the more intelligent and patriotic class of Russian citizenship, that whole country will soon be dominated and controlled by Germany, and the sacrifice of the millions of men who have died to check the world's domination of the German Empire will have been in vain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That by every principle of national honor and military strategy and for the defense of the civilization of the world, for which millions of men have laid down their lives in this great war, it is the duty of the United States and our allies from both a moral and military standpoint to immediately send a sufficient army into Petrograd and Moscow and other Russian points to defeat the murderous band of pillagers in Russia known as the Bolsheviks, and to protect the decent, intelligent, and patriotic people of Russia until they shall have been able to elect a representative congress to govern and control that country."

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the amendment go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie over and be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5236) to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, and request a conference with the

House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair. The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. OWEN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. McLEAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 69) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1919, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 14555. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Barrs Ferry, in said county, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 15495. An act to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, is a motion now in order to proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2812?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2812.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, this conference report is entitled to very deliberate consideration. It deals with a matter which has divided the public opinion of the country for a number of years, upon which there has been more or less of a deadlock in legislation; so I assume that Senators will desire an opportunity for a thorough examination of the details of the agreement which has been reached by the conference committee, and that the matter can not be disposed of in a few moments.

While that is pending, Mr. President, I desire to call attention to another situation.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to the other situation, I should like with his permission simply to make a suggestion in keeping with what he has already said, without making a speech, of course.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well; I have no objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. For the benefit of the Senate, on yesterday I had the full report printed in the RECORD, so that it appears in the RECORD this morning. It shows the bill as agreed upon by the conferees, and an itemized statement of each change made in the Senate bill as well as in the House bill; so that it will facilitate the examination of the report by the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it is very well that the Senator from Nevada called attention to that, so that Senators may know where to find the printed report.

Mr. PITTMAN. And the Senator from Nevada refrained from making any brief statement with regard to the changes that took place in the Senate bill, out of respect for the notice that the Senator from Washington had given that on this morning he would address himself to another subject.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate exceedingly the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. So soon as the Senator has finished I will make a brief statement—unless, of course, it interferes with some other Senator—in regard to the changes made in the Senate bill by the conference committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, this same report was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a week ago, the matter being presented in the House, so that the whole report and a copy of the bill have been on record in the House proceedings for more than a week.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the most conspicuous item of news in the headlines of the morning papers refers to an Associated Press dispatch from Paris, the principal digest of which I read from one of the morning papers, which I have at hand, as follows:

Delegates anxious to take up peace treaty and to end war status.

Mr. President, it has been more than three months since the solemn and formal armistice was signed, bringing to an end actual military operations between the allies and Germany; so that it arrests one's attention to read after that lapse of time as the principal news which is published in the world from Paris, to which the gaze of all men is directed, the statement that the delegates to the peace conference now, on the 19th day of February—the armistice having been agreed to on the 11th day of November—are beginning to become anxious to take up and consider, at least, the peace treaty to bring an end to the status of war.

I read a moment ago in an edition of a noon paper which has just been circulated the news—which will startle the world—that Georges Clemenceau, the great leader of France in the heroic war which has terminated in her victory, has been the object of an assassin's bullet. Fortunately for humanity, the assassin failed of his purpose, and Clemenceau still lives. I say fortunately for humanity, because of all men the world could least afford to lose at this juncture, in this great epoch of its affairs, is the French premier, who has stood for victory and for efficiency in the fight of civilization against the German hordes.

I mention that, Mr. President, because it seems to me that it is a symptom of a disease which is afflicting the world and social affairs, and which is being irritated and aggravated to the point where it may become chronic by the delay of the conference, which was called to secure and establish peace, in performing the duties for which it gathered. Assassination is a weapon of those who represent the internationale, of those who have taken up the cause of international revolution, which is now beginning to be active in the United States as well as in the countries of Europe and which needs to be cured by the establishment of definite and permanent peace.

Mr. President, there are two divisions of men upon this question. One of those divisions advocates the proposition that before we establish present peace we should provide, by some as yet ill-defined means, for permanent and universal future peace. The other division of men who are interested in this great question believes, on the contrary, that the first duty of the world is to establish present peace, to restore order in Europe, and that instead of satisfying ourselves with expressions of interest in the future welfare of mankind the leaders of the Governments should demonstrate their sincerity by relieving the present suffering which afflicts the world.

There is another division of public opinion upon this question, Mr. President. One division of public opinion upon the question of peace believes that permanent peace can not be secured for the United States or for the rest of the world by the traditional policies of the American Government. Those who take that view of the matter believe that in order to arrive at a satisfactory basis of peace not only must we ignore and neglect the duty of bringing the present war to an end, but that we should cast aside, as the refuse of government, the great policies of the past, and adopt new policies, and make, as they express it, a new order in the world. The other party believes that the great men who have formulated public opinion in America in the past, shaped its policies, and achieved its greatness were as sincere and as intelligent advocates of peace, of permanent peace, as those who are in charge of American affairs to-day.

So the question arises, Was Washington a friend of peace? Did he desire the world to dwell in amity and good will, one nation with another? And so the question arises, With what purpose did Washington enunciate a foreign policy for the new Government which his fortitude and wisdom had been the chief agents in establishing? Was its purpose war, or was not its purpose the same purpose which is now proclaimed throughout the world—to secure peace, maintain good will among nations, and security and happiness among the people of the world? I think that was the object of Washington's advice against entangling alliances. Was it the purpose of Monroe, when he in an earlier generation than ours proclaimed that famous policy which bears his name, to sow the seeds of war and discord? I think not. I think his purpose was peace. Was Cleveland an advocate of war when he enforced that doctrine when it was attacked? Was Roosevelt promoting war or was he securing peace when he, in his turn, as President

of the United States, resisted the efforts of the German Empire to invade the traditional policy of America? He was rewarded by an impartial tribunal to whom had been intrusted the prize to be bestowed upon those who contributed most to the peace of the world.

They were all for peace; and, Mr. President, all intelligent men and women are for peace. The question is, Does the proposition which is presented to the world tend to promote peace to a greater extent than those policies which have secured peace for America during the greater part of its career, or, on the contrary, does it add to the opportunity, to the cause, and to the temptation for war?

Mr. President, it is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that the matters contained in the proposed constitution of the league of nations, recently reported by a special committee authorized to investigate and report by the peace congress, are the most momentous in their effect upon the Government and the people of the United States since the Civil War. They are closely related, in fact, to the problems presented for discussion and determination by the people in the formation of the Constitution of the United States. In adopting or rejecting this constitution—and I quote the words which the instrument itself uses in characterizing it as a constitution—and thereby becoming or not becoming a member of the league established under it, the Government and the people of the United States will determine whether they are to remain the great sovereign and independent Nation, with the most complete self-government ever devised by man and the highest functions of citizenship ever enjoyed—a people controlling their own destiny, determining for themselves, through their constituted Government, the extent of their military preparations, the size of their armies and navies, maintaining peace and amity with the world during the greater part of their career, establishing for themselves their international relations—or whether, on the other hand, they are to merge their destinies with those of the other nations of the world, share their burdens, participate in their quarrels, and become a party to all the international complications arising from diversity of race and language and conflict of interests of the various peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Are we to surrender to an international council and body of delegates those high functions of sovereignty which heretofore we have exercised for ourselves, and vest in the jurisdiction of an international league the determination of our armaments, the decision of peace or of war, even in the most vital questions affecting our national honor, integrity, or material welfare? I think I can demonstrate that that is the issue which is to be determined.

There is this further question involved of whether or not we would be promoting the cause of peace in the world by the adoption of this constitution, or, on the other hand, would be plunging the world into a new set of controversies, and, by requiring every nation to meddle with every other nation's business, would be bringing about an indefinite series of armed conflicts. "Mind your own business" is a good motto for an individual, and heretofore it has been the fundamental principle of our foreign policy as a Nation. It has saved us from many wars and given us long eras of peace, in which we have developed our social and industrial life, brought happiness to our people, and waxed great and prosperous among the nations of the world. The question is now presented of whether we are to adhere to this policy of Washington and Monroe, of cultivating friendly relations with all nations and making entangling alliances with none, or whether we are to enter into a treaty and adopt a constitution of a league which binds us to a great number, and possibly to all, of the other nations of the world in the most entangling alliance that could be conceived, since it binds us as one of the guardians and guarantors of every right or interest of any of these nations which might be involved in actual or threatened war.

These are great questions, and if so decided as to commit the United States to what the President himself has described as "a new order in the world," will deprive our people of that high and mighty state which they and their fathers have builded for themselves. There is no other citizenship in the world so entirely free of class distinction, or discrimination, as that of the American people. There is no other nation which to-day is more absolutely sovereign than the United States. There is no other nation where an individual citizen, standing upon an absolute legal and governmental equality with every other citizen, wields an equal voice in determining the highest prerogatives of government. There is no other nation where all of its members occupy the high estate which these conditions secure to the American people. The question now presented is whether or not this high sovereign jurisdiction of the political heirs of Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln is to be in part surrendered and subjected to the control of strangers and aliens.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. President, in recent years of the right of the people themselves to direct the affairs of government; and if the people themselves are to participate at all in the decision of these mighty issues it is absolutely necessary that the question should be submitted to them for free discussion and full consideration in every forum and at every fireside. The basis of a successful republic is an intelligent public opinion. But there can be no intelligent public opinion without free communication of news, full information, and unhampered discussion, both in the press, in the public councils, and among the people themselves. Surely if these principles apply to the ordinary affairs of government they apply to an extraordinary program, by which it is planned to establish a "new order in the world." The constitution of the league of nations, which was printed in the afternoon papers of Friday, February 14, 1919, was framed in secret. Until it was so published the world, whose future was to be controlled by its terms, was purposely kept in entire ignorance of any of its provisions. It came forth full panoplied, as though born from the head of Jove. On the same day a eulogy of its terms and an argument in its behalf was made by the President. On the morning of February 16, 1919, there was published to the world a request from the President that its provisions be not debated in Congress until he should have an opportunity, in a private meeting with the members of the Foreign Relations Committees of Congress, to further speak in its advocacy and to justify not only the principles involved but the very form of its language, article by article.

In the meantime, under this plan, while Congress, the council of the people, is to remain silent, the various organizations, such as the League to Enforce Peace, the Society of Free Nations, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and other internationalists employing an ex-President of the United States as one of their chief lecturers and including members of the Cabinet, are busy in appealing to the American people in its behalf. Before the busy world, whose destinies are to be controlled by this new dispensation, has had an opportunity to thoroughly read and digest its provisions, we are requested not to make it the subject of debate in Congress until the President can again speak in its behalf. The situation is very similar to that when the people of this country indignantly protested against premature negotiations for peace with Germany, and were told to leave the discussion of terms of peace to the Governments involved and to busy themselves with providing the necessary funds.

So we are requested here, Mr. President, while the advocates of this supergovernment of the world are making arguments in its favor, to remain silent. It is a matter, however, of too much importance for us to remain altogether silent. No harm can be done by full discussion. These great questions should be considered from every standpoint and should be decided in the full light of public information and well-informed public opinion. If the proposals contained in the constitution of the league are meritorious, they will be strengthened by debate. If they are unwise or ill-advised, that fact may be disclosed by free discussion. No injury can possibly accrue to anyone by the freest and most painstaking examination of the provisions of this proposed constitution of the world.

We are all in favor of giving effect to "humane impulses" in the government of the world. We ardently desire peace. Whatever steps we can take which will relieve the oppressed, establish justice, inculcate virtue, and bring happiness to mankind we advocate. There is no monopoly of benevolence, of humane impulses, of the desire, if possible, to obtain universal and perpetual peace. The question is the adoption of means which will really promote to the utmost extent these great and beneficent ends. It is to be determined in the discussion of the league of nations what the language of its constitution imports and whether or not it will promote, in truth and in fact, the welfare of mankind. There are many who contend that it will provoke and precipitate war and entail untold misery upon mankind by the conflicts, jealousies, and surrenders which it would bring about. These are entitled to be heard. If their views and deductions are wrong, their fallacy will be easily exposed. It is, we are told, a day of "open covenants openly arrived at," and never was there a covenant since the chosen people followed the ark in the wilderness that was so fraught with good or evil for the children of men. If covenants are to be openly arrived at, this covenant, of all others, should be exposed to the light and to discussion in the open.

It is intended as a permanent and universal league and covenant. I think that feature may well be emphasized, and I will speak a moment later of the fact that there is no provision in it for abrogating any covenant of adherence to it. It binds

mankind and their destinies forever. The question at once arises whether, when we have once committed ourselves to its power, we can ever withdraw. It no doubt will be contended by its advocates that we can renounce our allegiance and abrogate our agreement at any time. It was so contended by many of the States who joined the Federal Union.

Some of them ratified the Constitution of the United States upon that express condition. Virginia did; I think that New York did, reserving the right to withdraw from the Federation at will. This, however, was decided to the contrary by the Union itself, and over the question was fought the bloodiest war, with the most pitiful sacrifices of a noble race of men. There is nothing, Mr. President, in the proposed constitution of the league of nations which provides for its abrogation or for the secession of its members. When power is once in their hands, its executive council, with its changing membership and the uncertain virtues of rulers, may likewise decide that its obligations are binding forever upon its members. It may well be considered by the Senate whether such a question should be left to implication or doubt.

In its simplicity of form, the absence of what might be called specialization of functions of the government of this constitution of nations, the machinery of the league is similar to the Soviet government of Russia. Its "body of delegates" and "executive council" and "permanent secretariat" are very largely a duplication of the framework of the Soviets.

Now, Mr. President, coming to the substance of this constitution of a league of nations, I may say that there are five principal matters of prime importance contained in the constitution, and it is in regard to those, because the others are of comparatively slight importance, that I desire to speak.

First. There is contained in this constitution a surrender by the several nations to the league of the power and discretion of determining the rules, methods, and degree of disarmament, and the relative and absolute size of the Army and Navy which any member of the league may maintain.

Second. Compulsory arbitration of all questions of every kind and description, even those which heretofore have been regarded as nonjusticiable, affecting the vital interests, honor, and even the independence of the nations.

There is no exception whatever. No question concerning the welfare or even the existence of the United States can arise in controversy with another nation which, if this league is adopted and its provisions enforced, our people will not be compelled to submit to a foreign tribunal and abide by its decision.

Third. The commitment of each member of the league, including the United States, if it should become a member, to participate in the wars and controversies of every other nation, and to assume the general guardianship of "various peoples," quoting from the constitution itself, in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Fourth. The participation by the league, through an international bureau of labor, in the domestic, social, economic, and industrial problems, quoting from the constitution of the league, "both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend." This is contained in article 20 of the proposed constitution, and the extent of the participation and powers of the international bureau of labor are left entirely vague and indefinite. What steps will be taken by the league or what power it will legitimately have to carry out the policies declared in this article are left to the wide discretion of the league itself, as there is no limitation placed upon it.

Fifth. The surrender by the United States to the other members of the league—I say to the other members of the league because the other members of the league constitute the overwhelming majority and will direct its action—of the power which under our Government is vested by the Constitution in Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations in arms and ammunition. This is contained in article 18 in the following language: "The high contracting parties agree that the league shall be intrusted with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest."

Of course, the league is to determine in what country its control is necessary. There is no limit, consequently, placed upon the power of the league to supervise the commerce of the United States or any other nation in arms and ammunition, which power under the Constitution of the United States is vested in Congress.

The control of trade in arms and ammunition is one of the most essential attributes of sovereignty. It has been exercised by the United States in various ways, at various times, and in relation to various countries. It is one of the chief weapons of defense, both direct and indirect, whether in the matter of export or import of arms and ammunition from or into the United States

itself, as in the case of neighboring countries, such as Mexico or Cuba, in the matter of a controversy between them and the United States, or whether in the matter of the shipment of munitions of war to other belligerents, in the exercise of their belligerent rights, in a war which, as in the case of the present war with Germany before we ourselves became a belligerent, indirectly involved our most vital interests.

Mr. President, the provisions of the constitution of the league as proposed, giving the league absolute discretion as to the armament of its several members, are contained in articles 7, 8, and 9 of the proposed constitution. I want to ask Senators to pay particular attention to article 7, especially to one part of it. It contains an unequivocal provision, as follows:

No State shall be admitted to the league unless its people give effective guaranties of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations and unless it shall conform to such principles as may be prescribed by the league in regard to its naval and military forces and armaments.

Under this the determination of what are the international obligations of the United States, once it has joined the league, will be taken from the people of the United States, where it is now vested, and given to the league of nations, and the United States will be absolutely bound by every order of the league, backed by its power, as to our naval and military forces and armaments.

Article 8 provides for a different degree of disarmament in the different nations in accordance with "the geographical situation and circumstances of each State," and that "the executive council shall also determine, for the consideration and action of the several governments, what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament, and these limits, when adopted, shall not be exceeded without the permission of the executive council."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will it interrupt the Senator from Washington if I ask him a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No.

Mr. REED. At this point will the Senator advise us who the executive council is to be? I do not mean the personnel, but how it is to be made up?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible to tell who the entire representation on the executive council will be. Five of its members of nine shall be the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, and they shall select four others. If they should select Germany, for instance—Germany, one of the great populations of the world, with something like 77,000,000 or 80,000,000 of people, an industrious people, capable of a high degree of organization, very likely would be selected as a member of the executive council—then if, with that capacity which Germany has for propaganda and for organization and for manipulation, she should be able to secure the cooperation of the other three of these additional four members, then, with one other out of the five, she could control the executive council of the league.

Mr. REED. But, as the league will stand on its initial organization, it will have how many members?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will have nine members.

Mr. REED. And how many votes will the United States have?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will have one.

Mr. REED. So that the question of how much of an army or how much of a navy the United States may have is to be determined by a tribunal upon which the United States will have but one vote and foreign nations will have eight votes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Exactly; that is the proposition.

Mr. REED. That is a complete surrender, is it not, of America's vital right to defend herself, to a tribunal that is made up, eight to one, of non-Americans and that may be composed eight to one of enemies of America?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Certainly; it is to be composed eight to one, of conflicting interests, of rival powers of America, entirely different in their environments, in their interests, and in their traditions from the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, is it not also true that any nation, however small, or without regard to its population, its extent, or its resources, will be as powerful, if admitted to membership in this league, as is the United States itself?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will be as powerful, so far as its vote is concerned. Of course, it would not be as powerful in directing the affairs of the league, for ultimately the league is based upon force, however much argument may be made to the contrary.

Mr. STERLING. I mean, if the Senator from Washington will permit me, in any decision arrived at by the league?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. Let me ask one further question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will first yield to the Senator from Nebraska and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that the small nations, about which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has spoken, would not be members of the executive council, and that, in order to have the same influence in the affairs of the league as the United States, for instance, a nation would have to be represented on the executive council?

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me a moment, I suppose the ultimate power rests in the league itself and in the delegates to the league, and each nation admitted to the league will have but one delegate, or at least one vote, though it may have three representatives.

Mr. NORRIS. Such a nation would not, probably, have a vote in the executive council unless it was a member of it, because the executive council is confined to a membership of nine, and they are named.

Mr. STERLING. It might not. They are named in the present constitution of the league; but when it comes to the action of the league itself Serbia or Cuba will have as much power in that action as will the United States of America.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield in the course of my remarks on this subject to any Senator to ask a question or to answer a question to the best of my ability, but I should much prefer that colloquies or debates between other Senators be postponed until the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Washington pardon me one further question in the line of those I was asking?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. REED. In this executive council, which is primarily to be composed of nine men, representing nine different countries, the United States, having one representative, is it not true that Japan will have a vote equal with that of the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Certainly; that is true.

Mr. REED. That is to say, we propose to enter a league in which we give to Japan a vote concerning our destiny equal to our own vote, although we refuse to allow a Japanese citizen to become a citizen of the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Japan would have the same vote that the United States has on the executive council; but I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is mistaken in the assumption that small nations will not be represented on the executive council. There is no such limitation as that. There are four vacancies on the executive council.

Mr. NORRIS. When those are filled, that will complete the list.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They can be filled by representatives of small nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; they might be; but the point I want to make is that in order for any so-called small nation to have the same power in this league that the United States, for instance, would have, it must be a member of the executive council, of which there can be but nine members.

Mr. POINDEXTER. So far as the executive council is concerned, a member would have more influence than a mere delegate.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, article 9 of the proposed constitution provides that "a permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the league on the execution of the provisions of article 8, and on military and naval questions generally." That is the disarmament program.

Under the provisions of article 7, which I have already quoted, when this program and method of execution shall have been decided by the league, the United States and the other members will be bound to conform to the same. I will call attention in a moment to the manner in which they will be bound and what the penalty will be if they undertake in any way to evade the decree of the league in fixing the size of their armies and navies.

Much unrelated irrelevant matter is contained in these—and I may say this without disparagement of any person at all—loosely drawn, vague, and uncertain articles. The principles just stated, however, are unequivocally expressed. Undoubtedly a reduction of armaments of the world is most desirable. With equal certainty, however, in deciding upon the terms of this disarmament the United States and its people should have the opportunity to ratify or reject the proposed plan, and the relative degree of such disarmament when so agreed to should be universal among all the nations of the world and should not be confined merely to

members of the league. It would be a curious proposition for all the members of this league to enforce peace to disband their armies and navies and to leave the great military nations which are not members of the league to build up a colossal military power; and yet that may be done. If one great nation is free to maintain such armies and navies as it sees fit while the members of the league disarm, the very condition sought to be avoided—namely, the temptation of conquest—would be accentuated. Under these provisions the decision as to the relative reduction of the Army and Navy of the United States, in proportion to that of great rival powers, would be taken absolutely out of the jurisdiction of the people and Government of the United States and vested in the jurisdiction of the league, where the United States has but one vote amid a large number of alien powers. Even a majority of these powers, many of whose interests are in conflict with those of the United States and whose traditions are entirely different, whose sympathies and predilections are subject to a wholly different environment, would determine this vital matter.

Mr. President, these provisions constitute a delegation and transfer of sovereign powers to an alien agency. These powers are vested by the Constitution of the United States in Congress. They can not be constitutionally divested.

It is argued by some that Congress, by accepting the arrangement made by the league of nations and making it its own, would thereby preserve its constitutional powers. I have heard that argued by Senators who are able lawyers. There is a good deal of speciousness in the argument, and yet it is entirely sophistical. The answer to that is perfectly obvious, that, if we keep the agreement which we make binding upon us as a Nation, under this league of nations Congress will not be left any discretion whatever to determine whether it will accept the decree of disarmament provided by the league, but it is bound and obligated in advance by the constitution of the league itself to have no other army and no other navy except that which is provided by the executive council of the league of nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not that same objection apply to every treaty which the United States makes with any other nation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know that I thoroughly understand the Senator's question. The same subject matter, of course, is not involved in every other treaty; it is involved in very few.

Mr. NORRIS. If I may be permitted, I will try to make myself plainer. Suppose in the regular way the United States Government enters into a treaty with a foreign nation. It will require legislation, perhaps, to give it effect; it will require appropriations, and the legislation and the appropriations must come before Congress under the Constitution of the United States. Congress may fail, it may refuse to carry it out, even though the Government has made the agreement. The same thing would apply to this league, would it not? If there was required to carry it out some action upon the part of Congress, Congress, of course, could refuse to take the action, just as it could in the case of a treaty, and thus violate the agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in the first place, the matters the Senator has in mind in other treaties are specific programs which are defined by the treaty-making power of the Nation. I said a moment ago in my discussion of this matter that if a disarmament program were specified and submitted to the treaty-making power of the United States, so that this Government would have an opportunity of using its discretion as to whether it was a wise or an equal or a well-balanced relative disarmament, comparing our own Army and Navy with the armies and navies of other nations of the world, it would be a very different proposition. There is a great gulf between that and the delegation of unlimited power to a foreign tribunal to fix such a program of disarmament as it sees fit without any specification whatever.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not that a difference only in degree and not in principle? For instance, suppose that, instead of those powers which the Senator is criticizing in this proposed constitution being general, they were specific, and specifically defined the standing Army and the Navy that the United States, for instance, would be allowed to maintain, still Congress could go ahead and disregard all that if it desired to do so, for, after all, this is going to be nothing but a treaty, and we could raise a larger Army or a larger Navy or a smaller one and thus violate the agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree with the Senator that it is a difference in degree only. I can see with perfect clarity a distinction of principle between a general, universal, unlimited

discretion and a limited and a specific program. I think there is a very marked distinction in principle between them.

Now, as to the Senator's statement that, after all, this is but a treaty, that is true; but it is a treaty adopting a constitution. It is true, as the Senator says, that Congress can ignore it; but, of course, if we are going on that theory there is no use in any discussion; we need not concern ourselves about this matter at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no, Mr. President; if the Senator will permit me, I am not going on the theory that we are going to violate our word. I only call attention to it because that is what we could do in the case of any treaty we have ever entered into since the beginning of the Government; we could violate it if we wanted to do so, and we could violate it under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I realize that fact. The Supreme Court of the United States has often decided that a treaty has no higher sanction than an act of Congress. There has been some confusion on the subject; but the law of the case is that they are on the same plane, and that the one which prevails is the one which is last in point of time. An act of Congress may be modified by a subsequent treaty, and a treaty may be modified by a subsequent act of Congress. But, Mr. President, we assume that we are going to live up to our obligations. We can violate the Constitution of the United States; I think we do, sometimes; but that does not in any degree lessen the importance of the Constitution. The care with which its provisions were framed was none the less because of the realization of the wise judges of human nature who were its authors and creators that not all men would observe its provisions. This constitution for the world is on exactly the same basis. The only basis upon which it can be discussed before the American people is that the American people are people of their word; that they will keep their agreement; and they ought not to be bound by an agreement made on their behalf that they can not and will not observe. We assume, in discussing this instrument, that when we attach the seal of the Government to it, it is binding upon the Government and upon the people of the United States. In order to escape its provisions, the only avenue is the avenue of dishonor and repudiation; and that is what we are seeking to avoid.

This is not an agreement for a specific program. On the contrary, it is the constitution of an alien tribunal, and a vesting of that tribunal with jurisdiction to make a program of disarmament in such degree, with such relations and proportions among the several nations as to the several elements of army and navy, as the league of nations in its judgment may determine; and the United States never will have an opportunity to pass judgment upon the question of whether or not the plan that is adopted is vital to the interests of the United States.

The situation would be wholly different from an agreement by treaty providing for a specific program of disarmament, agreed to through the constitutional agencies of the United States. It is clearly a delegation of powers of the Government of the United States to another power. We have had debates here as to whether or not the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for instance, and giving it power to regulate railroad rates, was or was not under the terms of the law a delegation of legislative power; and the rule has been laid down that if Congress fixes the measure by which the rates are to be determined, then the commission is a mere agent of Congress; but if we should establish a commission and say to that commission, "You take the power vested by the Constitution in Congress to regulate commerce between the States and operate under it in your discretion," there is not a lawyer in this body who would claim that such an act would be valid. Yet that is an exact parallel to the unlimited, general, universal power over armaments conveyed or attempted to be delegated by the Government of the United States to the league of nations by this constitution. If undertaken, it would be a surrender by the Government of the most essential, vital rights of the people, and of attributes of sovereignty involving the Nation's capacity to take such steps as it sees fit for the safeguarding and defense of its honor and vital interests. It is clearly a delegation of the powers of the Government of the United States to another power, and as such is beyond the capacity of the Government of the United States to enter into.

I will cite some authorities upon that proposition in a moment. The Government can not destroy itself. The trust of government is for the maintenance and protection of the Government. No Government can transfer its powers to some other Government over which it has no control. That is what is attempted to be done by this constitution of a league of nations.

It may be said, of course—and this answers the suggestion made, at least in one aspect, by the Senator from Nebraska—that notwithstanding the obligations of the constitution of the

league of nations, Congress may do as it sees fit. That, of course, raises the question as to the enforcement by the league of its decrees. See whether or not Congress can do as it sees fit. See what would be the result, under this constitution of the league of nations, if Congress undertakes to do what it sees fit after this constitution has been adopted. Read the constitution of the league and find out what the consequences will be. You may have the right to put on paper some other program, but what would be the result? The result would be that you would be then in a state of war with every other member of the league, and every other member of the league would have a right to use its military power to coerce Congress and the United States into the observance of the terms of the league.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to repeat, so that the Senator will not misunderstand me, that I do not want to be put in the attitude of advocating the theory that we should go into this proposition and then violate it; but I have called attention to that merely to show to the Senator, to my mind, that under the Constitution the same objection that he is making to this proposal exists in principle as to every treaty that the United States has ever entered into. Suppose we had a treaty with England that required the payment of money and Congress refused to appropriate and did not carry it out, it might result in war with England. If, with England, France and Spain and Holland were interested, it might result in war with them. If we make this agreement and then refuse to carry it out or refuse to obey it, we may still get into war. I concede that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not a question of "may," Mr. President. The language of the constitution of the league of nations is that—

Mr. NORRIS. That we would.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That, ipso facto, it shall be deemed to be an act of war.

Mr. NORRIS. And if we go into it and do not comply with our agreement, we ought to get into trouble.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think myself that if we go into it we ought to get into trouble, and we will get into trouble. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. The history of the world has shown that we have gotten into a good deal of trouble by staying out. We are just getting out of one of the big troubles now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a pretty good policy to apply right here to stay out, keep out, attend to our own business, and let other nations attend to theirs, follow the advice of Washington and the practice of Lincoln, stick by the old, tried traditions of the Government that generations have demonstrated to be wise, and be cautious about throwing them into the discard and accepting some untried nostrum to settle all the affairs of the world for all time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to make this observation, in view of the observation made by the Senator from Nebraska that we have gotten into trouble:

Europe has had about 100 wars in the last century, and we got into just one of them. When you get through with your little league of nations, if Europe should have a hundred wars we would be a party to all of them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it ought to be said, at least, that it is the theory of those who advocate this league of nations that Europe will not have a hundred wars. I may be wrong, and we may be wrong, but it is the object of this league to avoid those wars.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has pretty nearly that many wars now raging. That is somewhat hyperbolic, but it has quite a number of wars going on at the present time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Washington, in view of the remark of the Senator from Nebraska, that I do not think anybody will claim that the denunciation, as it is called, of a treaty is an act of war or can be considered as a just cause for war of itself. Everybody admits that in the case of any treaty that we make, after the circumstances and conditions surrounding the subject matter have changed and it becomes unsatisfactory to this country, Congress may denounce the treaty and say that we will not be bound by it any longer, but that that ever was construed as an act of war. I do not think was ever claimed before by anyone.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not claim that, Mr. President. That was not my claim.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well. Then, the Senator, it seems to me, should not claim that the violation of this proposed league-of-nations condition is at all on a parity with a mere denouncement of an existing treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. No; Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator was calling attention to what we would have to do, what the league could require of us, and if we did not do it we would be in war with the other nations under the league. I concede that under the league that might happen.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know; but the Senator from Nebraska, unless I entirely missed the point he was attempting to make, was contending that we are in the same position now if we denounce a treaty, and that therefore it would be no worse for us to go into a league of nations than it is to make a treaty with a nation.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the Senator from Connecticut, I think, failed to get the idea I wanted to convey. That is, in meeting the point made by the Senator from Washington that this is an unconstitutional proposition, that we are surrendering some of our sovereignty, my contention is that we never did enter into a treaty since the beginning of the Government but that the Congress—even the House of Representatives alone, not a part of the treaty-making power—might destroy the treaty and refuse to carry it out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am compelled to decline to yield for debate between other Senators, notwithstanding it is conducted with all good intentions, because it goes on indefinitely and destroys ultimately the continuity of the argument I am attempting to make. In view of what the Senator has said, if he will pardon me, I will say in this connection that the distinction is between a valid treaty and an invalid treaty. The treaties to which the Senator has referred are assumed to be valid treaties. Now, the argument here is whether or not this treaty is valid. There never has been a treaty in the history of the Government under which we undertook to delegate the power of the Government to any other power. There have been many treaties which bound the Government as to its international affairs; but there never was another treaty in the history of this country, or, so far as I am informed, in the recent history of the world—there have been some, the Achaean League, the Holy Alliance, and others, in former times, all of which proved to be utter failures—but there is no parallel whatever in the history of the United States for the transfer or delegation by the Government of the United States to another tribunal, not of the power to do a specific thing but of the right to assume the unlimited powers of Government within the sphere of its jurisdiction of the subject matters which are defined in this constitution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has the Senator forgotten the treaty between the United States and Great Britain regarding armaments upon the waters between Canada and the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I have not forgotten it. There is nothing whatever in that treaty that in any way is in conflict with the statement I have just made. There is not any international tribunal determining upon a limitation of armaments between this country and Canada.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In that case the United States and Great Britain mutually agreed as to the armaments and naval preparations on those waters?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The United States gave up its right to put naval armament upon those waters and—

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator evidently has not been listening to what I have been saying.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I have been listening quite closely.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator listened closely, he heard me concede that not only would it be legal but it would be desirable if the various nations of the world could get together, as the United States and Great Britain did in the case of our Canadian border, and agree upon a reduction of armaments. I said that that was what we should have done; and the case which the Senator from Nebraska has cited to dispute the argument which I have made is a demonstration of its soundness. It is exactly parallel to what I claim we should do in this case.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has been asserting that the legislative power of Congress could not be restricted with regard to armaments; and the treaty to which I refer is a direct restriction upon the power of Congress as to armaments.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not at all, Mr. President. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania in just a moment. The Senator from Nebraska entirely misapprehends what I said. What I said was that the discretion vested by the Constitution in Congress to determine the extent of the armament of the United States could not be delegated to another tribunal. I did not say that under the Constitution of the United States a certain reduction of armament, or entire disarmament, specified in a treaty could not be made the supreme law of the land.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I merely want to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the treaty to which he refers, between the United States and Great Britain, has relation to a boundary line between the two countries, and anything relating to a boundary line is always a matter of mutual agreement, and it is no precedent for any other thing than a boundary-line treaty.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The President of the United States has said in the speech which he made to the peace congress in vindication of this constitution of a league of nations that force is in the background; but he said it is in the background. In other words, there is a statement of the chief advocate of the constitution of a league of nations that unequivocally and ultimately the execution of this constitution is based not upon decrees or statutes but upon force.

Should Congress refuse to obey the mandate of the league in this respect, then the United States would be subject to coercion by this force so defined by the President. Furthermore, the United States would be subject to the discredit and shame of a violation of a compact solemnly entered into with other nations. This will inevitably be the result in the face of any vital emergency affecting the independence or safety of a high-spirited people such as ours. They will act as they see fit in vital emergencies, both as to raising armies, maintaining navies, and as to the compulsory arbitration of nonjusticiable questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The nations should avoid entering into an agreement which can not be kept, which compromises the interests of the people and subjects them to the shame of an inevitable repudiation of ill-advised, unwise, and unconstitutional agreements.

There should be a common-sense plan among all of the great military powers for a reduction and limitation of armament; but this plan should be specifically worked out in advance of its acceptance. It should be submitted to the Government and to the people of the United States for their approval or rejection; and, when approved, there should be an express reservation of the right of the people of the United States to abrogate the agreement upon due notice and due procedure. This blind commitment of the people to submit their future to the decision of a tribunal in which the United States is only one voice in a multitude, without limitation as to what its decision shall be, or any provision whatever for its discussion, acceptance, rejection, modification, or abrogation under any circumstances by the people, would be a betrayal of the trust and heritage of the Nation. It would mean the end of the high station which both as citizens and as a Republic we have occupied heretofore in the world.

The provisions of the constitution for compulsory arbitration of every question or dispute are contained in articles 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17. These contain many conflicting provisions. There is much repetition. The provisions are loosely expressed, indefinite, and uncertain, but in this mass of undigested and conflicting matter there is contained the indubitable provision for compulsory arbitration of every controversy, whatever its vital nature may be, even though it involve the integrity, honor, or essential interests of the Nation.

Article 12 provides—

The high contracting parties agree that should disputes arise between them which can not be adjusted by the ordinary processes of diplomacy, they will in no case resort to war without previously submitting the questions and matters involved either to arbitration or to inquiry by the executive council, and until three months after the award by the arbitrators or a recommendation by the executive council, and that they

will not even then resort to war as against a member of the league which complies with the award of the arbitrators, or the recommendation of the executive council.

I suppose the construction given to these various conflicting methods in these different articles would be that they are concurrent, and that it was left to the discretion of the members of the league to adopt one or the other, of course all being equally binding, and article 12, which I have just enunciated, compelling the arbitration of every question as I have already stated, they would all be equal in effect, in so far as they were concurrent and so far as all could be given effect.

Articles 13 and 15 provide entirely different and conflicting rules of arbitration, but do not in any way modify or suspend article 12, just stated. It is unfortunate that such an ambitious document as the proposed constitution of the world should be so loosely and more or less incoherently drawn. But, taking it as it is, the question to be decided in its adoption is whether or not the American people, in a great and vital emergency, such as many times confronted them in the past, will surrender their power of ultimate decision as to the course to be taken and give over in advance their freedom of action in the defense of the Nation. It is true there is contained in another article a provision against "external aggression of territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league." But slaughter of American citizens, invasion of American rights absolutely essential to the maintenance of the Nation, have often occurred without an invasion of territory or an attack upon political independence. This was the case in the war conducted against us on the sea by Germany, and in the brutal murder of our citizens and the confiscation of their property in Mexico. The destruction of our fleet and the control of our sea routes by an enemy power would not come within either of these exceptions.

I want to pause to say these are not exceptions to compulsory arbitration, but simply provisions that in the two cases mentioned the other members of the league agree to protect the interests of all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator intend to discuss later on the effect of the clause he has just referred to in reference to the preservation of the integrity of the domain of nations?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; I intend to discuss that, and to call attention to another effect of it.

Mr. REED. Then I do not desire now to anticipate the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Controversies in regard to immigration on the Pacific coast, or elsewhere; of naturalization; of alien ownership of land, neither involve political independence nor territorial aggression; and yet, under this provision, we are required to submit them all to the decision of a tribunal the great overwhelming majority of which is composed of aliens to our interests and institutions.

So as to the Monroe doctrine, when a threat was made to infringe upon it in Venezuela—once in the administration of Cleveland and once in that of Roosevelt. Neither of the conditions just stated were involved, and yet these were attacks upon a fundamental essential policy of the Nation, which ought not to be and can not be—if we are true to the trust which we have received from Cleveland and Roosevelt; and from Washington and from Monroe—transferred to the control of a league of nations or any tribunal established by it. It should remain under the control of the American people.

During all of this stupendous proceeding upon which for weeks and months the attention of the world has been concentrated for the devising of means to prevent future wars and establish universal and perpetual peace, wars and military operations have been in progress; and it is permissible to inquire whether the machinery here proposed would have prevented them, or was necessary to enable the United States to maintain peace. Was the league of nations necessary to enable the United States to preserve peace instead of war in Haiti, or in San Domingo, or in Honduras? Was a league of nations essential to enable the United States to preserve peace when it took Vera Cruz, or when it made war upon Villa in northern Mexico? Furthermore, if a league of nations had been in existence at the time, would it have furnished any resources not already available to the United States for the settlement of the Mexican question and for the preservation of peace between Mexico and the United States? Certainly, so far as force is concerned, the power of the United States as compared with Haiti, or San Domingo, or Mexico, or Honduras, is sufficient to put into operation the humane impulses which are to be gratified by the league of na-

tions; and it is difficult to see what element of value in the establishment of universal and perpetual peace in these countries would be provided by a league of nations not already possessed by the United States to compensate us for the obligations which we are asked to assume in the league by adding to our cares the protection of the territorial integrity of the several members of the league, and the guardianship of the moral, spiritual, and physical well-being of "peoples of central Africa." Furthermore, will the league of nations bring peace to Russia? There is already a league of nations, whose representatives are sitting in Paris along with their associate, the United States. We have not thought enough of this league to join it, but have taken great pains to differentiate ourselves from it, under the name of an associate power; while we have agitated for a league of a different kind, although up to the time of the publication within the last few days of the proposed constitution of the league no explanation was given as to wherein it would differ from the existing league. This existing league has been powerful enough to overcome the greatest monster that ever appeared among the nations—unregenerate Germany, which has been brought to her knees.

If this league has been so diverted from its purposes and so preoccupied in seeking for a permanent and universal league, for the establishment of future peace, that it has not been able to restore present peace, or set up orderly government in central Europe and in Russia, can we expect the proposed future league to accomplish more?

It is not going to be any more powerful than the present one. Why should we expect there is going to be some mysterious virtue in it by which it will do what the present alliance of the righteous nations of the world has failed to do?

If civilized and righteous mankind, organized as it is, acting with a governmental unity never before achieved, has not been able to bring peace in Europe or stop the war which is raging around its feet, can we expect that, as a compensation for the surrender of sovereignty proposed by this constitution, the league for which it provides will establish universal and perpetual peace in the future? On the contrary, with the additional obligations and complications of interest which it will create, will it not multiply the occasions for war? The test of intention is action. Benevolence is best displayed by conduct. The expression of "humane impulses" and of ardent desire for the future good of mankind must be judged by present performance. If the present welfare of the world, including our own people and our own soldiers who are garrisoning occupied territory in Europe, is neglected in the face of the threat of class war and of the existence of international war, can we give credence to protestations of interest in its future welfare? While talking of perpetual peace our voice is drowned in the clamors of war.

Article 10, Mr. President, of this constitution binds the United States as one of the contracting parties to undertake to "preserve," quoting from the instrument, "as against external aggressions the territorial integrity and existing political independence in all States members of the league." This is somewhat ungrammatical but its meaning and intention is perfectly obvious.

The next sentence authorizes the executive council "to advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled."

Mr. REED. The Senator has reached the point about which I rose to ask him a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Is it the Senator's opinion that under the terms of this league if Ireland was to conclude to set up a separate government it would be a part of the duty of the United States to furnish troops to assist Great Britain in suppressing Ireland?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. REED. Now, assume that Canada was to conclude that she wanted to set up a separate government and no longer be controlled by Great Britain, would it not likewise be our duty to furnish soldiers to cross the Canadian line to suppress Canadian patriots who might be undertaking to establish an independent republic on this continent?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, under other articles of this constitution the United States is compelled to take an interest, and the degree and the extent of the interest is undefined, in a war or a threatened war anywhere in the world. So far as the particular language which I just quoted is concerned, and to which the Senator is referring, I should judge, while I stand here on my feet, not having considered the question before, that there would be some question as to the recognition by the Government of the United States of the independence of Canada or of Ireland before we could determine what the obligation of this Government would be in that case under this language.

Another question that would arise would be whether or not the operations of Ireland or of Canada threatened the political independence or constituted an aggression upon the territorial integrity of Great Britain.

Mr. REED. Let me ask another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIMBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. To my mind this is one of the most interesting points in the matter. Let us assume that Russia is organized again under the old autocratic Government, that Poland has been erected as an independent republic, and that a portion of Russia—Russia having been admitted into the league—would want to join Poland and become a part of the Polish Republic, and Poland was to undertake to permit that and to assist in it, that, of course, would be an invasion of the territorial rights of the Russian autocrat. Would not that be a case where it would be plainly our duty, as guarantors against external aggression, to join the Russian autocrat to crush the Russian revolutionists and the Polish Republic?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is not any limit to the combinations of circumstances which can be conceived as entirely possible, and many of them inevitably arising in the future affairs of mankind, in which the United States would be bound to intervene under the language of the constitution which I have just cited. The instances which the Senator from Missouri has suggested are very pertinent and illustrate and illuminate the potentialities of trouble, the probabilities of trouble under these provisions.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Has he compared this particular clause with a similar clause in the Holy Alliance? If he has not, I would like to hand it to him at the proper time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not. It is said by some that this is not an entangling alliance. Some of the advocates of a league of nations have gotten into such a transcendental plane of logic that I have been unable to follow them. They have said that the Monroe doctrine is not affected. I always thought the Monroe doctrine was an American doctrine to be administered by America, and that was one of its essential elements. They propose to transfer its administration to Europe and say it is not affected at all. I have never quite understood the process of thought by which they arrive at that conclusion.

Another very ethereal and difficult—sublimated, as the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] suggests to me—process of reasoning is the assertion that the obligation which we here enter into by this constitution, if it is adopted, to defend every member of the league in all parts of the world and to assume the guardianship of unknown and undesignated peoples of Africa and elsewhere is not an entangling alliance. They seem to argue in some way which I am not able to understand that if you carry on the process of entanglement far enough you finally get to a point where it is not entanglement.

The fact of the case is, Mr. President, that, looking at it from the standpoint that I think the American citizens look at it, the everyday man on the street, the way I look at it, from a common-sense standpoint, no such colossal burden or entangling alliance was ever before conceived in the world, not only in the United States but in the world at large.

Under this obligation the United States assumes, if it is adopted, the protection of every nation which shall become a member of the league. In this we would have the cooperation of other members who were willing and able to fulfill their obligations under this article, but, whether acting jointly with them or alone, or with such of them as would live up to their obligations, the United States would be bound to tax its people and sacrifice its soldiers to make war in behalf of every foreign country, member of the league, when attacked in the manner indicated, either by a member or by a nonmember nation. No such colossal burden or entangling alliance was ever before conceived in the world. Instead of being an instrument of peace it is the fertile seed of war—the dragon's teeth from which, when sown, armed soldiers will spring.

Article 19 places upon the United States the further burden of the joint guardianship with the other members of the league of "colonies and territories which, as a consequence of the late war, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves," of "certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish monarchy," and "other peoples, especially those of central Africa." The further scope of this guardianship, to which the United States pledges itself by this article, is unlimited and undefined and presumably would be left to the unlimited and undefined discretion of the league

of nations. The extent to which this guardianship shall be delegated to a "mandatory state" as agent is left entirely in the discretion of the league.

That means that the degree of responsibility of the guardian nation to be directly exercised by the league itself is left in the discretion of the league. How much responsibility shall be assumed by the mandatory state it is not for us to determine. It is for the league to determine, and when determined by the league we become responsible for it.

The article states—

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory state shall, if not previously agreed upon by the high contracting parties in each case, be explicitly defined by the executive council in a special act or charter.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I want to ask a question to get the Senator's construction. Perhaps he has given it. Does the Senator find that there is anything that tells us whether being appointed a mandatory is compulsory or can it be refused by the nation selected as a mandatory without violating the treaty?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing in the constitution expressly fixing a rule upon that subject. In my opinion the necessary construction of the instrument is that when a nation is designated by the decree of the league, then that decree is upon the same basis as the other decrees of the league, and the nation has no discretion and can not refuse to assume the responsibility.

Mr. LODGE. That is the conclusion I came to; but, of course, like most of the others, it requires a good many vigorous inferences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think after these various examinations, which are quite necessary, have been made you will find, after all, that where there is a provision that the league can designate one of the nations as a mandatory, and there is nothing else on the subject, the implication is perfectly plain that there is no discretion left in the mandatory itself. In other words, it would require an express provision to enable a member of the league to refuse to obey an order made by the league.

As to these various peoples of the world, for whose future welfare we would thus become responsible, the article states that "the mandatory must be responsible (to the league) for the administration of the territory, subject to conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses, such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic." Other obligations in addition to these are also stated. Not satisfied with the service to mankind, greater than all others, which has been rendered by the establishment of a government without class, with equal opportunity, and subject to the control of the people, in the United States, and with that protection which we have extended under the Monroe doctrine to other nations in the Western Hemisphere, we thus undertake, practically unsolicited and unsought, to extend our responsibilities and cares into the uttermost parts of the earth. The expense, labor, and sacrifice of life which will be the direct result of the performance of such an obligation on the part of the United States are past calculation. The indirect injury, however, to the spirit of our Government in thus assuming, along with others, a despotism, however benevolent we may conceive it now to be, over large portions of the world is far more sinister than the losses which we will inevitably suffer directly in men and money. It is an insidious menace, undermining the principles of the localization of government, of nationality, and substituting for them the principle of despotic internationalism, in which the self-determination of all peoples will be merged.

Correspondingly, while assuming obligations of government in Asia, Africa, and Europe, this article, at once, by the same terms, surrenders to Asia, Africa, and Europe American policies which have been the prize jewels in the American diadem of state. Emergencies which have arisen in the past may arise in the future. The expulsion of Maximilian from Mexico, the protection of Venezuela from Germany and Great Britain, the freeing of Cuba from the despotism and cruelty of Spain under Lincoln, Roosevelt, Cleveland, and McKinley, in pursuance of the famous policy of Monroe, would have been impossible under a league of nations. All of these issues instead of being decided by the United States, in the light of the high ideals of these traditional doctrines would be left to the administration of an alien tribunal, established under the league of nations.

What the outcome would be no man can tell. Whatever it would be, it would be the decision which at the time corresponded with the motives and beliefs of the majority of the foreign members of the tribunal. This, of course, means the end and obsequies of American determination and control of these matters.

The Monroe doctrine is an American doctrine. If its administration is transferred to the congregated nations of the Old World, it ceases to be a Monroe doctrine. Its application, construction, and existence would then be dependent upon the mercy of the very nations against whose interests it was promulgated. Its fate can easily be foreseen.

I have in my desk verified, detailed statements of continuing outrages upon Americans lawfully in Mexico—the murder of our citizens and the confiscation and looting of their property. For six years we have allowed this, in one form or another, to proceed. It is to be presumed that some day the self-respect and honor of the American people in these matters will be protected by their Government. However, if the constitution of the league of nations is adopted, our Government will have surrendered forever its power to protect its citizens in Mexico and will have committed them unequivocally to the judgment and discretion of the other nations of the world. Our citizens may continue to be the victims of Mexican disorder, and their blood will cry in vain to their country for help. There can be no help, for the power to protect its citizens—the chief and primary function of government—will have been transferred to another.

Surely the "humane impulses" of the administration can be exercised in the performance of our obligations toward the small countries of the Caribbean and of Mexico by the most powerful Nation in the world without the aid of a league of nations. If we have tears to shed over the woes of mankind, we can shed them without stint, and are free to put into effect at will such measures as our benevolence may dictate within the traditional sphere of our influence. If we desire perpetual peace in America—and by that I mean in all the Americas—do we need a league of nations to enforce it? Have we not already in the union of the States, each one built from the sacrifices and toil and from the brains and courage of its inhabitants, a league of nations amply able to guarantee such peace in the western world as our people may deem wise and just?

The purpose of the league is stated to be universal and perpetual peace. The question to be determined by the American people is whether the establishment of these additional obligations and interests will not inevitably make for war where heretofore we have been able in the exercise of our sovereignty and under the benevolent policies of our country to preserve peace. Furthermore, there are some prices that are too high to be paid even for peace. Our fathers could have had peace in 1776 at the price of liberty, but they chose war and were aroused by Henry's cry, "Is peace so sweet or life so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" They could have had peace in 1860 by the sacrifice of the Union, but they chose war, war without measure, to save that Union which was the palladium of free institutions.

Who can say that the sacrifices of any of the heroes who fell for the preservation of the Union in the North were too great a price to pay for the countless blessings which have come to their children and to the world, bought with their blood? We could have had peace in 1898, when the anguished cry of helpless Cuba, ground under the cruelties of Weyler, fell upon our ears. But we chose war, and who can say that the freeing of these people upon our immediate borders from tyranny and persecution and the establishment of security, industry, and order was not worth the price we paid? We could have had peace in 1917 by supinely surrendering our rights upon the high seas and abandoning the trade and commerce of our people, essential not only to prosperity but to national existence. Had we been willing to follow the advice of pacifists and take the coward's part of servile submission to the orders of a monster among the nations, to betray the trust of Government and leave our murdered citizens unavenged, there would have been no immediate war. But our Government in its essential functions would have been ultimately destroyed, because its essential function is the protection of the honor, the lives, and the rights of its citizens.

France might have had peace in the fateful days of August, 1914, when her soil was invaded and her homes devastated by the Huns, if she had been willing to pay the price. That price would have been slavery of her people, the destruction of her civilization, and with it the civilization of the world, but, to the honor of France, she chose war.

In the search for universal and perpetual peace those who advocate it at any price make no distinction between the war of conquest and lust of Germany and the holy and righteous war of defense of France. On the contrary, both now and at all times through the war, the principal advocates of peace at any price seemed rather to favor the cause of Germany than that of our own country and its allies. They seem now to be desirous of saving the vandals of devastated France and Belgium from retributive justice. Instead of peace by the victory of the allies they seemed to favor a peace of submission to the conquest of the Huns.

If their views had prevailed, the great principle of the protection of our rights and the lives of our citizens from violent aggression would have been abandoned. Germany, perhaps, would have triumphed in Europe, and, having consolidated the resources of her enemies there, would have carried her campaign of conquest to our shores. Who except the pacifists and those who then favored peace at any price can say that we should have made such a poltroon peace? Who except the cowards that would seek safety in nonresistance can say that the victorious war which we waged with our allies was not wiser than the inevitable war which we would later have been compelled to wage unaided if we had remained neutral while Germany absorbed the resources of France and England and consolidated them to her purposes? Universal and perpetual peace is much to be desired, but only when it can be obtained in honor and without the surrender of the vital interests of the Nation. Furthermore, there are occasions when the vital interests and honor of the Nation are not immediately involved, but when plans and movements are being set afoot for purposes of aggression which, if not checked, will inevitably menace both honor and safety, when wisdom dictates that such movements shall be checked in the beginning—by war, if necessary, as a last resort—rather than to allow the menace to develop to such proportion as will call for greater sacrifices in the end.

The national liberty of action to determine and carry out these policies is the most essential attribute of national sovereignty. All this would be surrendered by the constitution of the league of nations, and the destinies of the American people in all such crises would be taken from their own control and vested in the league. It can not be done, at least, in silence. It must be known, and the American people must be advised of this proposed surrender of their liberties.

It is a curious circumstance, Mr. President, that the South—and I speak of it as one of the South—which failed in its great effort for independence in 1865, having obtained control of the Government of the Union, now is about to achieve the sardonic triumph of depriving the North of its independence and setting up over it a supergovernment. The North conquered the South by force of arms; the South now seems to be in a fair way of conquering the North by a diplomatic surrender of its liberties. The South having fought the most heroic war, in many respects, in history, and having lost and been subjected to the domination of the North, now apparently has no objection to go still further and subject both the South and the North to the control of an international government. It would, indeed, be a sardonic triumph. Will the North agree to this extension of the idea of the Union to include the alien nations of the Old World? The Union, as it was idealized by Lincoln, was not only in its essence the federation of the States, but, equally as important, it was the sovereignty and independence of the United States. Without sovereignty and independence the Union of the States loses its soul and becomes a mere piece of machinery. It was for the independence and sovereignty of the States that Washington gave himself, and whose achievement placed him at the very pinnacle of human greatness. To surrender that now would be to destroy the living work of all of our mighty dead. To now place in the hands of the council of the league of nations, all but one foreigners, nearly all of them speaking an alien language, born and bred to different traditions, accustomed to a diverse environment, with different ideals and varying interests and motives, that control over the sovereign action of the American people for which so many of our precious heroes have labored would be as though it were a pitiful murder of the very soul of our fathers in their own house, builded by their hands. It would be in its result the same thing as treason, because it would be a transfer of allegiance.

The most active advocates of this transfer of ultimate control of our most cherished rights to a foreign tribunal tell us—and this is one of the most frequent arguments—that we need fear nothing, for we will have friends among the other representatives on the tribunal who will protect our interests and sympathize with our aspirations. This, in itself, is a confession of the betrayal of the great trust of government, because it is a confession that the decision of these matters, instead of depending upon the American people themselves determining their own fate, depends upon the friendship or benevolence of an alien tribunal. No doubt the American people could have depended upon the wisdom, disinterestedness, loyalty, and honor of Washington. No other in human affairs has ever been more to be trusted. It was suggested by some that he be given a crown, but the sons of liberty, though they loved Washington and trusted him without limit, realized the immortal principle that liberty is too precious a thing to be trusted to the power of any man or set of men. And so it was that they denied this power even to Washington and vested it in the representatives of the people, under the people's control, subject to

the people's retirement, and set up a Constitution which is a model of checks and balances, by which the powers of government are divided, one department balancing another, and various procedures operating as checks upon each other. Many despots have been benevolent, and some of them loved their people, and yet they ruled as despots. Have the American people come to the point when, as confessed by the advocates of the league of nations, who say that in various contingencies we can depend upon the good will of the alien members of the league—they say we can depend upon the friendship of the Anglo-Saxon members of the league and others—but have we come to the point that we must submit our fate to the charity, to the good will, or to the benevolence of alien powers? That is what is proposed. Understandingly our people will not do it; and if they do so, it can not be binding upon their children. Those children, when they come into control of the affairs of the Nation, when emergencies arise, will repudiate the surrender of their liberties, assert their ancient rights, even though at the price of war. This is inevitable, and the vice of such an obligation is that it leads to repudiation, to dishonor, and to war, although it is done in the name of high ideals and perpetual and universal peace.

Mr. President, the powers vested in the league of nations by this constitution necessarily must be exercised by men. If we may suppose that the men who will first be chosen to act for the nations upon this league will be both good and wise, and that we can trust our great policies of state, of peace, security, and the honor of the United States in their hands, what guaranty can the advocates of the league give us that the changing personnel of its council, or its delegates, or a majority of them, will continue to be wise, benevolent, charitable, or humane? Good and great men have been scarce in the history of the world; and why should we assume that the league will be dominated only by the good and the great? The teachings of statesmen in the past have been to subject the officials of government to rule and to law, for the very reason that the weaknesses of human nature can not be trusted with discretion and unlimited power. The constitution of the league of nations proposes an opposite principle, where the most comprehensive powers ever delegated to an official body are vested in a number of delegates and in an executive council without checks or balances or definite rules or limitations; where the legislative, executive, and judicial power over the world is consolidated in a single body of men, with no rules of procedure except such as they make for themselves, the wisdom of their action being left entirely to the people of conflicting interests, of varying degrees of intelligence and civilization of the several nations, and to the characters of the delegates they may choose. The history of the world shows that this dependence is frail and uncertain. Inevitably this unlimited discretion will be exercised in accordance with the motives, interests, environment, tradition, ideals of the constituted members of the league, and to this heterogeneous mass of controlling influences the destinies of America will be submitted. These destinies are now under the absolute, unrestricted, unlimited control of the people whose destinies they are and who, consequently, have no motive to betray—because it would be a betrayal of themselves—acting under the set and clearly limited rules established by the classic phrases of the Constitution of the United States.

Under the proposed loosely drawn, inconsistent, ill-defined constitution of the world these destinies will be submitted to the control of nations, however civilized, humane, and enlightened they may be, who have no personal, direct interest in our destinies, but who, on the contrary, have destinies of their own to guard, and in whose guardianship we admire them for looking out for the interests of their own people, which in many aspects are in direct opposition and conflict with our own.

The Government of the United States has no constitutional power to make a treaty transferring any of its sovereign powers to an alien tribunal. No treaty which takes from the various departments of the American Government, established by the Constitution, the jurisdiction therein conferred and transfers it to an extraconstitutional body, and particularly to an alien body, and particularly an alien body composed of foreign sovereign nations, is valid. Chief Justice Taney, in deciding the case of *Doe et al. v. Braden* (16 How., pp. 635-657), said:

The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.

Here is a clear implication that courts have the power to annul any treaty which violates the Constitution of the United States. The same views were expressed by Justice Swayne in the case of the Cherokee tobacco, *Eleventh Wallace*, page 616, where he said:

It need hardly be said that a treaty can not change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument.

Also Justice Field expressed his views to the same effect in the case of *Geofroy v. Riggs* (133 U. S., 258), where he "declared," as stated by Second Butler, *Treaty-Making Power*, page 392:

That while the treaty-making power of the United States extended to all proper subjects of negotiation, and is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in the instrument itself against the action of the Government, or of its departments, or from those arising from the nature of the Government itself and that of the States, it would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States.

As stated by Prof. Woolsey:

The treaty-making power must be exercised for the purpose of preserving national life, and not for destroying it.

We are told by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Taft that the war in which we are now involved, and in which we do not seem to be able to make peace, was a crusade for the benefit of the world. We are told that we went to war, not for any selfish interests of our own, but for the benefit of mankind at large. Crusades and conscript armies do not go well together. Governments have no moral right to sacrifice the lives of their soldiers, and to levy compulsory taxes upon their people, merely to gratify a feeling of benevolence toward the world in general. This country, the people of the United States, would never have supported the war with Germany as they did, with such unanimity and heroism as they exhibited, upon any such basis of idealism as a crusade for the interests of the world at large. We went to war, and contributed of our substance and of our blood, to protect and defend the vital interests and ultimate independence of the United States itself, and no Government has a right to plunge its people into a war for any but a similar purpose.

It has been said that our soldiers in France were fighting for the 14 points, and yet every one of them that has ever been questioned on the subject was extremely doubtful as to what the 14 points were. The fact of the case is that the soldiers went to France because most of them were conscripted and drafted; and they exhibited there, with those that volunteered—and they were all eager in the service of the Nation—a heroism, in the face of a new species of warfare which the world had never before experienced, which added new glory to the already bright pages of American history. What were those men fighting for? Why, when they went into battle they went in with a cry, as though it were the shriek of some note of the *Marseillaise*, of "*Lusitania!*" They went into battle against the Germans because they were fighting for their country and their country's flag. Their object in that war was not to carry on a crusade, but it was to defeat the Germans.

Mr. President, there is an internationalism abroad in the land—an internationalism of the élite and an internationalism of the proletariat rampant.

There is internationalism at the top and internationalism at the bottom, and both are moving forward through different means and methods to the same destination. Germany is supporting both. The idealists and peace-at-any-price pacifists are approaching by one road. The Industrial Workers of the World and their Bolshevik allies throughout the world are approaching upon another. Both lead to the same destination—an international and despotic government of the world. Both involve the surrender of nationality and the setting up of a centralized despotism. It must be a despotism, because no government in whose discretion is centered the ultimate control of the affairs of the whole world can be free.

This movement is backed with great resources and ample funds. Such organizations as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, endowed by a subject of Great Britain, with resources acquired in the United States, are among its most powerful supporters. These great organizations are able to employ, at high prices, influential lecturers, including even an ex-President of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator if we are to understand that statement literally?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. That is, that ex-President Taft is under the pay of those organizations?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Such organizations as I have referred to.

The founder of the society which I have just mentioned—the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace—is an open advocate of the reunion of the United States with Great Britain—in fact, he has written a book on the subject—and of the amalgamation of our Government with the British Empire. The organization of a league to enforce peace is but an enlargement of this conception. It is the same principle and a part of the

same program. In a dispatch on yesterday from London it is truly stated:

The American and British viewpoints are totally different. America gets nothing out of the war except a large share of responsibility in world affairs, while Great Britain gets a powerful ally in the maintaining of peace. The British insist that America is morally forced to assume this responsibility.

Another explanation of the news that comes to us of the favoring of a league of peace by Europe, which no doubt is astounded that it is put forth by America.

I want to point out now what we are getting into.

Under the provisions of article 16 of the proposed constitution, upon any refusal on the part of the United States, as a member of the proposed league, to comply with the covenants of compulsory arbitration of all matters, as set forth in article 12, it "shall thereby ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league which hereby undertakes immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or official relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between other nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not." In other words, once we have entered into this fatal covenant, which contains no provision for our withdrawal from it, our failure to obey the decrees of the league, or of tribunals constituted under the terms of its constitution, automatically makes us an outcast and a pariah among the nations of the world, and plunges us into a state of war with all the other nations composing the league.

And yet this is the covenant that we are asked to make by a number of college professors, and by Miss Julia Lathrop and Miss Jane Addams—excellent women, who have done a devoted work in the world, deserving of the thanks and consideration and gratitude of our people, and yet who have not had any experience which qualifies them to frame a constitution for the government of the world.

This proposal is also advocated by a number of college presidents, one of whom a short time ago I noticed criticizing some remarks that I had made in the Senate in opposition to a league of nations which, by its advocates upon the floor, was compared with the Government of the United States, and that is a very favorite comparison of its advocates. They want to set up over the world a government such as that which our fathers set up over the States of the American Union, and subject our Nation to those powers which the Federal Government exercises over the States. This great college professor—I think it was the president of Harvard University—said that the constitution of a league of nations did not have anything more to do with the Monroe doctrine than it had to do with the price of sugar. He seemed to think that it did not have anything to do with the price of sugar, and that shows the impractical mind of many of the advocates of a league of nations. It has a great deal to do with the price of sugar, because the purpose of such a league is to prevent war, and the price of sugar is one of the most fertile causes of war. We had war in Cuba over the price of sugar. Sugar is one of the standard bases of food; and every war that the world ever saw, in its ultimate analysis, was based upon a controversy over the food of mankind. It has to do with the price of beans. If beans had been cheap and plentiful in Mexico, we would have been saved the war which has ravaged that unhappy land. Beans are one of the principal articles of their diet.

This college president said, however, that if these objections which were made to the proposed league of nations were valid, another one could be framed which would not be subject to the objections. Evidently he was accustomed, as so many college presidents are—I used to have an idea that they were all filled with the wisdom of Socrates—to hiring men who know things, like business managers of great business institutions. They have been so accustomed to being able to employ men who could teach the varied learning of the world that if you puncture a league of nations full of holes they have not the slightest doubt that they can hire somebody who can frame up a good one for you.

This is the frightful compact, Mr. President, that we are asked to make—to surrender our destinies to the league, with the awful penalty of immediate war upon us by all the combined nations composing its membership, should we decline in any respect to obey the decrees of the league, however destructive they may be of our happiness or prosperity.

This is the substitute we are asked to make for the peaceful and happy state under which we have lived during the greater part of our national career in peace and amity with the world. We have had but few wars, and have avoided war by avoiding the cause of war. We are now asked to avoid war by multi-

plying immeasurably the cause of war, and by surrendering to a heterogeneous league of diverse races our sovereign rights and privileges. By such a course the independence which was preserved by the patriotism of our people and the heroism of our soldiers in the fighting which has just been concluded will be surrendered, and the guaranties of peace which victory has afforded us will be mortgaged to every nation in the world.

If this constitution is ratified without being submitted to the American people in a political campaign, where it shall have been made an issue, and upon which they will have had an opportunity to render judgment in an election, then self-government in America will have disappeared. We are facing an abyss and the American people should not be led into it blindfolded. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will desist from any demonstrations.

DEMORILIZATION OF TROOPS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to read a letter to the Senate as the basis of a few remarks I desire to make; and I read this letter because it is typical of hundreds of letters that I am receiving and that I assume other Senators are receiving. It is dated from a small town in my State:

DEAR MR. REED: Just a few minutes of your time. I know you have many such requests as I am going to ask of you, but this is my first one. It is this:

I have a boy who offered his services to the Government in August, 1918, and I was glad of it; but listen: The war is over. We have always employed or worked four or five hands. Two of the boys are in the Army; the others have quit and gone to farming; but none we get are experienced hands like my boy and the one that was drafted and is not out yet. This is the strange part of it: They are not working at all, or practically so.

Listen here: I got a letter from my boy to-day saying he was not working two hours a day—just lying around waiting for some one to die, as his job is in the laboratory in the autopsy of the dead. Here I am, working 12 or 14 hours a day, and my partner is doing the same. Do you think this is a fair proposition? I have done three men's work for the last two years, and they will not let my boy out now to help me do my work on the farm. Now I am needing my boy to help me the very worst kind. Here in the spring, when we need help so bad, the farmers need this and that thing done, such as we were called on the other day. We have pumps to repair, cars to load, fertilizers to unload, cream separators to deliver, and no help; and my boy is lying down there at Camp Jackson and has not done 15 minutes' work in three days. It puts me out with the Government, or with the Army officers, or wherever the blame lies.

Then he makes a request that this matter be investigated; and his son is at Camp Jackson. That is a letter from an old farmer, not always grammatical but full of good sense. I have another letter, that I am not going to read, which is from a private in the Air Service, who states that he has been making every effort to get released, and that he is there under great disadvantage, great loss, and he can not get released.

Mr. President, this war has been over now for a good while. Peace ought to have been made before this; and if we had been making peace instead of making contracts for the future, if we had been settling our own disputes instead of undertaking to provide for the settlement of all disputes that may hereafter arise, I think we would have been much nearer a final settlement of the peace conditions. But waiving that, it is certainly true that the keeping of the American boys in these camps in America is absolutely inexcusable.

I said the other day, and I repeat, that I believe the economic loss in labor plus the expense of the support in camp of each one of these men is not less than \$100 a month, and a million men in camp would mean a hundred million dollars a month. We are being asked to tax our people to the very limit, and we are taxing them to that limit. We are cutting down the resources of the country and the power of production by keeping as consumers something like three-quarters of a million men, instead of turning loose that number of men and making producers of them. It is a piece of stupidity without parallel, and, I say, unqualifiedly, without excuse, and the sooner it is remedied the better for our country.

How do you suppose a farmer feels who said to his boy 12 or 15 months ago, "God bless you, my son; go and give your time, and, if need be, give your life, for your country, and I and your mother will try to struggle along and take care of this farm and keep it going," when he knows that his boy has been kept in camp 12 or 14 months; that he not only has not seen Europe but that it is now certain that he never will be sent to Europe, and it has been certain for months that he will not be sent to Europe—how do you think that farmer feels when he sees his fields going to waste and his business going to destruction while his son is confined in a camp, doing nothing but responding once in a while to roll call or turning out on dress parade?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have had in the last 60 days more than a thousand letters telling the same story related in the letter just read by the Senator. When he pictures the home of the old farmer whose boy has been carried away it recalls a letter that I received yesterday from a young wife on a farm. There is a scarcity of labor in Mississippi. This young woman's husband was unable to get labor to work his little farm last year. The season is passing very rapidly. They must begin to prepare for the crop there during the present month if they are to make a crop during this year. The boy is in one of the camps in the United States. He is not needed, but I am told by the department that they can not let him out just now.

I am glad the Senator has called attention to the matter, and I wish it were possible to do something to urge the War Department to perform its duty in regard to turning the men out, as well as paying them what the Government owes them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am getting tired, as far as I am concerned, of wasting time with the War Department. I know something of what is the matter, because I happen to have heard a conversation almost immediately after the war closed when members of the War Department were asked what was going to be done to stop the mobilization of troops who were then on the way to camps, and what was going to be done to release the soldiers who were in the camps; and at that time the statement was made, in substance, that great care would be taken lest the labor market should be overcongested by the return of these troops, and an elaborate scheme had been worked out to release first those of particular occupations, and then those of other particular occupations. Then the reason for these releases appeared a few days later when a certain distinguished labor leader protested that already the country was being overrun with a surplussage of labor.

I do not think it is difficult at all to tell who is telling the War Department how and when to release the soldiers from the Army. I think it is time that Congress took some effective action to compel the demobilization of troops in this country. I think any department that will keep nearly three-quarters of a million men lying in camp, at great expense to the Government, at great inconvenience to themselves, and at great loss to the country, after war has been over as long as this war, is incompetent or worse than incompetent. It is time to end this business. It is time to speak with indignation, because the people of this country are feeling an indignation.

The idea of somebody sitting down here at the War Department, whether he is a Secretary of War or whatever he may be, and saying that he proposes to release these American citizens in such a manner and in such form that the labor market will not be congested! As though you could benefit the labor market by compelling the labor of the country to support hundreds of thousands of idle men, for in the last analysis the burden for the support of all must come from those who produce!

I suggested at the time of the conversation I referred to if the War Department could just get it into its little head that the American people had some sense and knew something about managing their own affairs we would get along better. I suggested that it is an absolute truth, although, of course, very much doubted in these days, that the citizen who holds no office at all has as much brains in his head as the individual who happens to fill a public position; that the boy who knew enough to run a great business, as many of them did, and entered the Army as a private because he was a patriot, might actually have as much sense about his own business affairs as some lieutenant of the Regular Army who never had earned a dollar in his life, who started into West Point at 17 years of age and has been on the Government pay roll ever since, and who never had any experience in life. If they would simply say to these boys, who are American citizens and who represent the average of American intelligence and American energy and American thrift and American brains, "You can go," they would not need to watch where they went or how they went. It would be found that they actually had sense enough to go back to their homes and to their fathers and their mothers and their wives and their sisters and their sweethearts and their jobs, and that they did not need the tutelage, they did not need the guardianship, of a Secretary of War or a Chief of Staff or a Lieut. Blank, whatever his name may be.

Mr. President, I have got very great respect for these gentlemen personally, but there is a theory abroad to-day that the people of the United States do not know anything, that all the wisdom in the land has been concentrated here in Washington, that the most of that has been concentrated in a few departments; and yet in the majority of cases the men in those departments could not hold a first-class job in a responsible business concern in the country.

I am simply trying to appeal for the doctrine of letting the American people have a chance to attend to their own affairs. I

am appealing for the doctrine that American boys should be allowed to return from these American camps.

Now, I propose to make an appeal for another class of men. There are across the seas nearly 2,000,000 American boys. The war is over. It is finally over. If it is not finally over, then Foch and Haig and Pershing and all the statesmen of Europe are madmen or worse than madmen—they are idiots—for they have had Germany by the throat since the 11th day of November; they have had her at their mercy; they have had their bayonets pressed against the breast of Germany, and in a position at any moment to destroy her; and if at this time they have left her in a position so that the armies of France and of England and of Belgium and of Italy can not take care of that situation, then they have been acting, I say, like madmen; and I am sure they have not so acted.

If this is true, why should our troops be kept there longer? If you tell me it is the lack of transportation, I ask this question: If we could send 300,000 men each month to Europe through seas that were infested with submarines and that were sown with mines, through seas that were so dangerous that every vessel had to be convoyed and had to run upon a zigzag course, why can we not, when the seas are open and clear from all danger, return them as rapidly as we sent them?

I have a letter in my possession from a colonel, a colonel who went into this war from the ranks of civil life, who, knowing or anticipating the war before most men did, prepared himself for it, educated himself for it, qualified himself in the highest degree—a man who never flinched from any difficulty, and who never shirked any danger, who never protested against any hardship as long as the war lasted. I received a letter from him a few days ago in which he said: "So far as I am concerned, so far as the officers are concerned, of course we are quartered in a way that is reasonably satisfactory; but you will be surprised," said this colonel, "when I say to you that, probably, our common soldiers are suffering as many hardships or greater than they were during the war, because," he said, "our transportation, which we had largely borrowed from France and England, has been withdrawn from us, and we are actually finding it difficult to get our supplies; and our men are staying here during the winter months, when the ground is sodden and the air damp, when the rain is pouring down in torrents day after day, when sickness is rife, and when these men are enduring the greatest kind of hardships;" and, he added, "if anyone believes that these troops want to be kept here a single minute for any other purpose than to force a just and honorable peace that individual is mistaken."

Mr. President, I have appeals sent to me every day, as do other Senators, that would melt a heart of stone—the appeal of mothers for their sons, of mothers whose hearts ache, whose eyes are blinded with tears for the want of a sight of the gallant fellows they gave birth to and whom they sent abroad in the service of their country. They want them back home, and they ought to be brought back home. I have appeals from fathers who say that their business is going to ruin—the business in which their son was one of the chief pillars and stays. They want their sons back to help save their business. I have appeals from widows for their sons to be sent back in order that they may preserve the estate that needs their care.

You can go to the War Department from now until you are black in the face, and you will get the curt answer of some military gentleman that they have a general order that can not be varied from. A general order may be necessary, but I protest that the keeping of this American Army abroad another day is a wrong upon that Army; that it is a wrong upon this country; that they should be returned at once; and the 60 or 90 days that have been frittered away are 60 or 90 tragic days filled with heartaches, filled with loss of time, and filled with a loss of money.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have very great sympathy with the views expressed by the Senator from Missouri with respect to the men who are in this country. I do not know any reason why we should have half a million or three-quarters of a million in camp in this country long after the war. As far as the men abroad are concerned, can the Senator advise us whether the tonnage at the command of the Government will enable us to bring the boys back from abroad more quickly than they are being brought?

Mr. REED. I can not advise the Senator whether the tonnage at the command of the Government will bring them back, but I can say that a Government that could get plenty of tonnage to carry men to Europe ought to be able to get tonnage to bring them back, and that if I were dealing with Great Britain, that has at its command so much tonnage, after Great Britain was asking and receiving of us all she receives from us, I would have the boats.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator will recall that we were something over a year in sending the Army across, taking them to Europe, with all this tonnage at our command.

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator. The Senator was not in when I began my remarks. I said we had taken them over at the rate of 250,000 to 300,000 a month, and we ought to be able to bring them back at as rapid a rate.

Mr. WALSH. That would take some eight months, would it not?

Mr. REED. Yes; but we are not bringing them back at that rate, and we are not approximating that rate. As nearly as I can make out from the statements in the newspapers, instead of bringing them home on passenger ships we are trying to transform or transmute some freighters into ships to bring them back. We were told—I saw it in the papers the other day, and I assume that it is correct—that in an interview the Secretary of War said it took 49 days to change one of these freighters into a passenger vessel.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is a member of the Military Affairs Committee and I am not, but I got the impression from what I learned about the matter that much of the deplorable condition that undoubtedly exists at the debarkation port of Brest is due to the fact that the returning armies are congregated there in such a number that they are unable to get ships with which to take them out.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is true, although I did not get it as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I got it in the newspapers through an interview with Senator OWEN that they have a very large number of men at Brest, which is said to be a very bad place to keep men, and they have not ships with which to move them. But the fact that they brought the men to Brest not having the ships to move them does not excuse the failure to have the ships.

It is the business to have these ships, and I repeat if we could get them over at the rate of 300,000 a month through seas that were infested with submarines and sown with mines we ought to be able to get them back through seas that are open and not in danger. They are engaged, according to this newspaper statement, and I think it is correct, in transforming a lot of old freight ships into passenger ships, and the statement purporting to come, as I said a moment ago, from the Secretary of War was that it took 49 days to change one of these ships; and when you have it changed I will venture the assertion that you will not have a very good ship to haul human beings in.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. But why is it that we do not get the ships and bring the boys back that we had to take them over? Why do we not demand them? Why do we not get them back as a right? We have certainly done enough for France and England in this war, and we are certainly doing enough now when we are controlling the price of American foodstuffs and American products for their benefit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri said that in a letter which he had received from some commanding colonel there was a statement that the transports were being taken from us. May I ask the Senator if he understood from that—

Mr. REED. The Senator misunderstood me. Transportation in France—the motor transports, the cars, and things that haul goods over there in France.

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, the letter refers to the interior transportation in France, not transports?

Mr. REED. Yes; transportation in France was the term I used.

Mr. LEWIS. I was interested to know what that did refer to; but I nevertheless ask the Senator if he does not recognize that many of the ships which we were permitted to use for taking the men over while we were at war were ships of the countries which are generally spoken of as our allies, and now that those countries are at peace they have taken those ships for their own uses, and they are wholly out of our command, and we are powerless to control them, and if that is not one of the exceeding difficulties we are now contending with?

Mr. REED. I can not tell you just what our difficulties are, because it has been the policy of the State Department to keep as profoundly secret as possible from Congress many important facts that Congress ought to have known. So I can not tell you exactly what the situation is.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. But I make this remark, if the Senator will let me finish the sentence. I have already made it. When we

count the obligations that France and England are under to the United States and the obligations they are daily being placed under by the furnishing to them of foodstuffs and of raw material and the control of prices for their benefit, but at the expense of the American producer, I know they would furnish these ships if the proper kind of demand was made, and it ought to be made mighty quickly.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask my friend what method would the Senator from Missouri suggest to enforce France and Britain to put their ships at our command? I should like to have it myself.

Mr. REED. If the Senator wants to know, I will tell him what I would tell them if I was running this business. Instead of writing leagues of nations, with perpetual peace in them, instead of spending my time talking about some scheme that is to concern the civilization of the future, I would say to the gentlemen running those countries: "I need some ships. I need them now. I want you to give them to us. I believe you will give them to us." And if they did not give them to us I would see to it that every benefit and advantage they have in the American market was taken away the day after to-morrow. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are totally disregarding the rule of the Senate. The Chair did not make the rule; the Chair does not approve of it; but it is the rule of the Senate that no marks of approval or disapproval can come from the occupants of the galleries; and it will be the very painful duty of the Chair to clear the galleries if this demonstration occurs again.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that this difficulty was foreseen by a number of Senators before ever we began to transport our Army to France. When the first appropriation bill was passing through this body with the increased appropriation for our Army, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was, I believe, the first one who brought this subject to the attention of the Senate. He insisted at that time that there should be a distinct provision put upon the appropriation bill that would require England to furnish just as many ships to return our soldiers as she furnished to take them over. If that had been done, this difficulty never would have arisen at this time.

I wish to say to the Senator I am told there are three English ships put at our disposal for the transportation of all the troops we have on the other side to this side. I do not know whether that number is correct or not, but I have seen it stated in the press, and I have also had an official of the War Department make the same statement to me.

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me one suggestion, though he ought not to be interrupted, I am only anxious that the War Department shall have no further blame upon it than it should bear, and that wherever it is not responsible for any particular condition that fact should be made known and plain to the American people. May I ask my able friend from Missouri if he contemplates this thought, that while it would be an act of goodness and justness for Britain to give us any shipping she has, must we not consider that she is using many of her own ships to take her own soldiers back to their homes in Australia, in Canada, and other portions of the globe, and that that probably consumes much of her ships which heretofore she had at our service to bring soldiers over to France?

Mr. REED. Does the Senator state that as a fact?

Mr. LEWIS. I am merely stating from newspaper report. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not going to sit here all the afternoon admonishing the occupants of the galleries to obey the rule of the Senate. If this occurs again the galleries will be cleared.

Mr. LEWIS. I am compelled to reply to the able Senator that I read that in the public report, as that is the only way, of course, we can get any news touching what Britain does. If it be true, we have to consider it; if it be not true, then it will probably mean that Britain has some ships which if accessible it would not be inappropriate for this country to ask the use of. I was only calling this fact to the attention of the Senator that he might consider it in connection with his presentation of a very worthy subject.

Mr. REED. I did not mean when I asked the Senator if he stated that as a fact to tell us the source of his information, but I wanted to know whether the Senator understood it to be a fact, because of the manner in which he put the question to me; it was rather hypothetical and I did not know how to reply to it.

Now, my understanding is that Great Britain is using her ships and that she is using some of them to transport her sol-

diers back home, and she is using a great many of them in commerce; that Great Britain, unlike the United States, has been very forward looking and has been prepared to invade all countries with her commerce the moment her vessels were released.

Mr. President, I have also been informed by the vice chairman of the Military Affairs Committee recently that Mr. Baker said that by April we would be bringing over our troops at the rate of 300,000 a month. I hope that prophecy will turn out better than some others we have had, but if we are going to bring our troops back from Europe at the rate of 300,000 a month in April I want to know why we are not discharging them in the month of February in the American camps and getting them out, and getting all of them out. The greater the difficulty in getting soldiers back from Europe, the more that is delayed, the more reason there is for emptying the American camps and stopping this enormous drain upon our Treasury.

Mr. President, there is a limit to the resources even of America. This wonderful land, with a wealth so much greater than we imagine, has nevertheless mortgaged her future to an extent that no other nation prior to this war has ever mortgaged its future. We have dealt in billions as in former times the world dealt in millions. The apparent prosperity of the hour is that kind of prosperity which a man enjoys who has mortgaged his home for \$10,000, and therefore has \$10,000 in the bank as ready cash, but who nevertheless is in debt \$10,000. The illustration is not happy. It would have been better if I had said the man had mortgaged his home for \$10,000 and had spent \$9,000 of it and had \$1,000 still in bank. Sooner or later the pinch hour is bound to come, and that peace will be greater or less just as we act wisely from this time on.

The first thing manifestly to do is to stop the waste to some extent. All war is waste. Every boy taken from the farm means not only the loss of that man's time but it means more than waste, it means perhaps the farm half cultivated. That means higher prices in the market when you come to aggregate it altogether. It means that this man taken from his home lives at an expense two or three times greater than he would have lived under in his own home. It means the disarrangement of all business. It is but common sense to get these men out, to get them back, to let them cease being consumers, and let them become producers, and instead of being a public burden let them become a public benefaction.

Get the Army back as soon as we can get it back; stop the expense. Then will be the time to begin to hope, through the productive capacities of this vast Army of splendid young men, to rehabilitate our fortunes and to stop that strain and draft and drain upon our resources, which, if they be not stopped, will ultimately produce very hard times in this country.

Mr. President, the man who keeps a million men in the field one day longer than necessary deprives this country of at least \$2,000,000 a day, in my opinion, indeed, I think a much larger sum. We are going to be asked to buy bonds in an enormous quantity, but the people of this country are going to be in no temper to buy bonds unless they find the Government is willing to cut down its expenses.

In that connection I desire to say the war is over. When the war began, we started in erecting acres and hundreds of acres of buildings in Washington, and we began importing clerks from all parts of the United States and putting them into those buildings. I think we must make allowance for waste; we must make allowance for miscalculation; we must be very charitable in our criticism; and yet, as I went through those buildings day after day, I was impressed with the fact that the lives and the limbs of those clerks were actually being jeopardized because they were crowded in so thickly that they were falling over each other. It was my hope that when the war was over that thing would cease, and that these clerks would be returned to their homes, at least a very large percentage of them; but you can go down through those buildings to-day and you will find that the number of clerks has been but slightly decreased.

Mr. SMOOT. In some of those buildings the number of clerks has been increased.

Mr. REED. I am informed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that in some of the departments the number of clerks has actually been increased. You can not get the head of a department to cut down his clerical help. There is first one excuse and then another given for not doing it. I am about prepared to say on these matters that the only way to retrench is to retrench, as somebody once said the way to resume was to resume.

Why, Mr. President, this Senate, discovering that these temporary buildings out here in front of the Capitol would require over a million dollars of expenditure in order to make them usable, and believing that there would be a reduction in clerks,

passed a bill to discontinue the work upon those buildings. That bill went to the House of Representatives, but it was followed there by the representatives of these departments, and they succeeded in persuading the committee in the House of Representatives not to report the bill, or at least to take no action upon it. So the million or the million and a half of money is to be expended on these buildings after the war is over to house an army of clerks after the army ought to have been demobilized and returned to their homes. I do not say that to criticize the House of Representatives; I have never indulged in any criticism of that great coordinate branch of our Government; but I say, it to criticize the department chiefs, who went down to the House of Representatives and persuaded them that they had to keep this army of employees.

Mr. President, that you can heap the burden upon the people for a while—for our folk have been good-natured and have paid their money out like thoroughbreds during the war, mortgaging their incomes, mortgaging their future, and doing it gladly—is no certain reason to believe that they are going forever and a day to continue to pay these taxes, when they have a right to believe the money is being wasted.

I had intended to say a word, and I have said a good many words. It is time somebody said something about getting these armies home; it is time that they found some means down at the department whereby a second lieutenant can not keep a man lying there almost rotting in camp, who is worth four or five thousand dollars a year at home, or if he is not worth four or five thousand dollars is worth four or five dollars a day at home. In the circumlocution of camps affidavits that you have dependents upon you, solemn proof that some great calamity will befall—all these things are required before a man can get discharged who ought to have been discharged within 10 days after the war was over; who ought to have been sent home, and gladly, sent home, and probably paid a month's wages to start him out with. If you had given these boys 30 days' or 90 days' or even six months' pay, as they did in Canada, and let them have gone home you would still have been money ahead, for you would have saved their keep.

It is mismanagement; I unhesitatingly say it is the grossest mismanagement. I unhesitatingly say the time where patience has ceased to be a virtue has arrived, and for one I protest against this mismanagement. I do not know whether it will do any good to protest; I do not know that it would do any good for this Senate to pass a resolution; but unless the situation is remedied very soon I am going to offer a resolution regarding it.

I want at this time to give notice that on Saturday, after the reading of the Farewell Address of Washington, which, I presume, will still be read in pursuance of the ancient resolution of the Senate, I shall address the Senate, with its kind permission, upon the league of nations.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to ask what bill is now pending before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is now before the Senate.

MARKET PRICE OF LIBERTY BONDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I coincide very largely, if not entirely, with the views of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I am receiving letters every day from parents asking that their sons may be sent home; and I am receiving letters from soldiers in the camps here and in the camps abroad, asking to be sent home. Many of these soldiers state that they have positions awaiting them, but that those positions can not be held up indefinitely. Yet there does not seem to be any way that we can get them home.

There is another matter that I want to speak about, and which I think is not entirely out of place in connection with what has just been said by the Senator from Missouri. I had hoped the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. SIMMONS] would be here, but he has been called out of the Chamber. I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is here, and he is also a member of the Finance Committee. I want to ask him or any other member of the committee a question after I have read a letter, which I hold in my hand.

I have noticed in the newspapers of my State advertisements of firms or banks that they will purchase liberty bonds, inviting the holders of such bonds to come and deal with them. I received a letter from a friend of mine in Seattle, calling especial attention to these advertisements, and particularly calling attention to the fact that many of the national banks are encouraging people who hold liberty bonds to come in and sell them; also calling attention to the fact that the liberty bonds are being discounted from 5 to 7 per cent, and that the people who were urged a few months ago to buy liberty bonds and who did so at a very great sacrifice, acting under the patriotic appeals that

were made to them by these same bankers, were being compelled, in order to get food and to sustain themselves, to sell their bonds at a discount to the very same bankers who had appealed to their patriotic instincts to purchase the bonds some time ago.

I took the matter up with the Treasury Department to see whether or not the Treasury was doing anything or taking any steps to try to maintain these bonds at par, and apparently but very little has been done. I wrote this friend of the situation, and I have his letter in my hand, which I desire to read. I see the chairman of the Committee on Finance is now present, and I want to call his attention to this letter with reference to liberty bonds, and then to ask him a question. This gentleman says:

Beyond question the Congress of the United States can maintain its bonds at par. Is it right that this should be done? If so, why not do it? Should the great mass of our interest-bearing debts be permitted to get in the hands of a few, and at a "shave" at that? Already lines of men and women here in Seattle stand at the national bank counters—and no doubt do so elsewhere—waiting their turn for the "shave," notwithstanding the advice of these "patriots" not to dispose of them for less than par. People have to pay taxes, and ought to; they also have to purchase food. To do this it is calculated to set them to thinking when compelled to sell a United States bond to a national bank for less than 94 cents over the same counter which they paid 100 cents per dollar only a few months ago.

I will admit that we may not know just how to protest, which makes it all the worse for those who stand for law and order in all things.

Now, Mr. President, what I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance, or any other member of that committee, is this: Is anything being done or is any proposition being considered for the maintenance of the liberty bonds of this country at par, especially the liberty bonds to a certain amount anyway, that are in the hands of people who by force of circumstances are compelled to dispose of those bonds in order to get a living, in order to maintain themselves? It does seem to me that something ought to be done in behalf of the clerks who, for instance, were practically forced by a departmental head to skip and save out of their monthly earnings a few dollars with which to buy a \$50 bond or a \$100 bond, who now, when the necessities of life force them, in order to raise some money, to sell these bonds, and they must sell them at a discount of from 5 to 7 per cent.

It probably would not be proper or advisable to make these bonds good in the hands of the men who hold them by the thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars worth, but it does seem to me that something ought to be done, at any rate, so that the man and woman of limited means who may hold \$50 or \$100 or even \$1,000 worth of these bonds should have them maintained at par.

I do not pretend to know very much about how these things can be done, but it does seem to me that if a fund could be provided at the Treasury, out of which bonds up to \$100 or \$1,000 would be redeemed at par upon a proper showing to protect the Government, it ought to be done. I should therefore like to know of the chairman of the committee whether there is any proposition being considered or whether anything has been done under which this can be accomplished?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the Senator understands that one of the most difficult questions that can confront any nation is that of always keeping its government obligations at par. There has not been a time since we began to issue liberty bonds—and especially is this true of the latter issues; in fact, it is absolutely true as to all of the issues except the first—when they have commanded par in the markets of this country.

Mr. LODGE. Except the three-and-a-halves.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said except the three-and-a-halves—and they are now below par. The Government, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has of course been very much concerned about this situation and has discussed with the Finance Committee possible ways and means of removing this condition. There is a provision, as I now recall, for a sinking fund, which sinking fund is not adequate, I think, and should be increased; but it was thought at the time that if a sinking fund were provided, it would help very materially to keep these bonds at a higher level. I do not think anybody thought that it would be possible for some little time, even with a large sinking fund, to bring them immediately to par.

One of the troubles about keeping these bonds at par grows out of the fact that a great many people have bought them through loans and upon the installment plan. They did not themselves have the money to invest, so they went to banks and borrowed it; the banks extended them credit and gave them time in which to pay, so as to permit them to make payments as they were able. In many instances these purchasers have found themselves unable to meet their payments, and consequently unable to hold their bonds. In other instances

persons who have bought these bonds have found that they needed the cash which they had invested in the bonds. This situation has forced them to throw great quantities of these bonds upon the market. That is one reason that has caused a decline in the liberty bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not asking for the reasons for or causes of the decline.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am giving the reasons, so that I may finally inform the Senator as to a statute which is now under contemplation by the Treasury Department and by the committees of the two Houses.

There is another scheme, which has become a sort of a system in this country on the part of designing speculators, which has had a great effect in pressing down the price of these bonds in the market. It is a scheme whereby issues of stock—wildcat stock, we sometimes call it; stocks of different kinds—are taken by agents and peddled all over the country. Wherever they can find a credulous person in possession of some of the liberty bonds he is offered these "high-interest bearing," "high-profit earning" stocks, according to the stories of the agents, for these low-interest bearing bonds; and they succeed in gathering up, so the Secretary of the Treasury advised the committee, enormous quantities of these bonds, which are immediately thrown upon the market and converted into cash at any price that can be obtained for them. That has had a very great tendency toward depressing the price.

To meet that situation, the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the Finance Committee and to the Ways and Means Committee of the House a bill which he has prepared, which possibly may meet and overcome the evil; but that is a question yet to be determined. That bill is under consideration. I am very much inclined to think, if that bill passes, it will stop that method of exploiting the holders of these bonds and the throwing the bonds in such vast volumes upon the market.

Outside of a sinking-fund method and outside of another method which has probably helped to some extent to keep these bonds from going even to a lower level than they have now reached is the practice of the War Finance Corporation of each month setting apart a fund for the purpose of purchasing these bonds in the open market. I do not know how much that fund is, but I am advised that in recent months this institution has put in the hands of its agents in New York, and probably in Chicago and at other points, many millions of dollars.

Mr. LODGE. I think they have set aside for this purpose something over \$200,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to say that, in the aggregate, up to this time I think that corporation has invested something over \$200,000,000 in the purchase of liberty bonds for the sole and only purpose of trying to keep them from falling to a lower level or in the effort to raise them to a higher level. Those are methods that ordinarily would accomplish a greater result than seems to have been accomplished in this case.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator—he may have stated what I am about to suggest, but if so I missed it—surely we put in one of the bills passed by Congress a provision for a special fund to be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the nature of a revolving fund, to purchase bonds with a view of sustaining their price.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the Senator; we did that. So that the Secretary of the Treasury, I will say to the Senator from Washington, and the committees of the two Houses in charge of this matter have been alert and have, within their limitations, been doing what seemed to them to be expedient and necessary to help against the situation to which the Senator from Washington calls attention, and which, I think, is a very grave situation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can the Senator tell me how the revolving fund to which he has referred is used? Is it used to buy bonds promiscuously or can an individual take his bond to the Treasury and get it redeemed at par?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I think it is used largely in the markets where bonds are bought and sold for the purpose of maintaining a standard price.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Has the committee considered any proposition that would make it possible for the holder of a hundred dollar bond to go to the Treasury Department and, upon a showing of his original ownership and of his necessities, have that bond redeemed at par?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; and I think, if the Senator will reflect, he will reach the conclusion that it is impossible for the Government to guarantee the par value of these bonds, unless the Government is ready and able to redeem all of them, if it becomes necessary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, does not the Senator think that a plan like that could be worked out?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think, Mr. President, that if the Government were able to redeem all of its bonds there would be no necessity of issuing any more bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not suggesting and did not put a proposition that to my mind would involve the redemption of all these bonds, but there are people who own a \$5,000 bond, a \$10,000 bond, a \$20,000 bond, or a million dollars in bonds. About those people I am not worrying, although I should like to see all of our bonds at par. I am not worrying particularly about bonds of the larger denominations to which I have referred, in the hands of people who are able to hold those bonds; but it seems to me, as I said a while ago—and I confess that I do not know very much about these financial matters—that we could provide a fund, and hedge it about with such restrictions as would prevent the Government being flooded with these bonds, under which the holder of a \$100 bond or a \$500 bond, on a proper showing and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury might prescribe, so as to prevent the bonds being poured in, could present them to the Treasury and have them redeemed at par. It may be difficult to work out such a plan, but it seems to me something of that kind could be provided, and I wanted to ask whether the committee had considered anything of that sort?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I will say to the Senator that no such proposition has been presented to the committee or discussed by the committee. That would be a very difficult proposition to work out. Of course, we could not very well say that the Government will redeem certain bonds of certain denominations and will not redeem bonds of other denominations. If it were desirable to provide that the Government should set apart a fund to be used in the purchase of the bonds of such holders as might be in distress and might by force of circumstances be compelled to put them upon the market, that could be done.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I have in mind, something of that kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. That could be done, but I do not know whether or not that would be a wise thing to do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to me that something of the sort ought to be considered. It is a very important matter. The difficulty of it should not dishearten us if it is possible to work it out. The Senator has suggested in two sentences what I have really been trying to get at. The class that the Senator describes is the class I wish to take care of, namely, those who have a \$100 bond and have to dispose of it in order to get some money on which to live—people who are in distress. The plans and methods the Senator has described have not taken care of the situation; they have not prevented these bonds from going way below par, and something ought to be done to meet this particular situation.

Mr. President, the man who has a \$5,000 bond knows that the bond is going to be redeemed some day, and that when it matures it is going to be paid in full by this Government; everybody knows that; but what I should like to see done is to provide a fund of some sort to take care of the bonds that will be taken care of when they mature, of course; but which should be taken care of now, in order to meet the distressing conditions that confront some of our people. I wish that some effort would be made to create a fund in the Treasury Department that could be used in that very way.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I merely desired to make a suggestion with regard to this subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I am through.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we are struggling against an unfortunate situation. The bonds were sold at an artificial price. The exemptions and the rates attached to them were not sufficient to make them sell at par in the market when they were placed. We relied on the patriotism of the country to buy those bonds for more than they were worth. The result is, of course, that, as they were not sold to meet the market when they were issued, they have never been able to meet it since, because they were sold above their real value.

The 3½ per cent bond was made a desirable bond, and it remained above par until very recently certainly, although carrying the lowest rate of interest of any of the liberty bond issues; but it was given an exemption, which held it up. The other bonds never were worth what they were sold for when the loans were placed; that is the trouble. The difficulty of meeting such distressing cases, as the Senator has described, has given me, for one, a great deal of thought; but it is very hard to see how we can remedy the situation, because, if we begin to redeem

the \$100 bonds, we shall find a great increase in the number of hundred-dollar bonds to be redeemed at par. We have made some provision on this subject, which the Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, but it has been only palliative; and now everywhere in my city the newspapers are full of advertisements of readiness to purchase these bonds, to be bought by people who can afford to hold them.

The fundamental trouble is in not having met the market when the bonds were issued. If that had been done, people would either have bought them below par, or they would have bought them at par when they were worth it. We have a very difficult situation, and I, for one, confess that it is very hard to see how it can be met.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I were the Senator from Washington, in answering that letter I would advise the writer of it that up to the present time we have issued over \$16,000,000,000 worth of bonds, that there is staring the country in the face at the present time a further issue of thirteen to fourteen billion dollars' worth of bonds, and with that amount of bonds in circulation it will be absolutely impossible, as long as money is worth what it is to-day, to maintain those bonds at par.

If we should agree to redeem at par all \$100 bonds, every issue of bonds hereafter would be of \$100 bonds, and it would simply mean that in the case of every loan that was put up and sold it would be only a very few months until the Government would have to redeem in some way the whole amount of the loan.

The Senator could say further to the writer of the letter that at the rate of 4½ per cent a taxable bond, such as is provided for in the law now, will of necessity sell for less than par. Money to-day is worth from 6 to 7 per cent; and therefore a bond of this kind that is taxable will not bring in the market more than about 94 to 94½ cents on the dollar.

If we want to make a change in the value of the bonds already issued, the terms of the bonds must be changed; and I do not believe that will be done. The Senator from Massachusetts has well stated that these bonds when sold, at the rate of interest they were carrying, were not worth par by any manner of means; and I know thousands of people who subscribed for liberty bonds with the distinct understanding that they would sell the bonds, and they were perfectly willing to pocket the loss.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. SMOOT. Millions and hundreds of millions of dollars of bonds have been sold in that way, and bought for that very purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. They were perfectly willing to give that 5 or 6 per cent to the Government. That is the case with many people; but now the bond is meeting the market, as every other obligation is to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. And it will have to meet the market hereafter, with an additional amount of bonded indebtedness.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks the exemption from taxation of the Federal farm-loan bonds, and the attracting of money in that direction, has affected in any way the market value of these bonds?

Mr. SMOOT. Just as soon as the Federal Farm Loan Board offer a bond issue, inasmuch as the bonds are nontaxable, as the Senator knows, they are taken immediately. The Federal Farm Loan Board could issue bonds to-day, if we should authorize them to do so, to the extent of two billion, of three billion, or five billion dollars and sell them, without a doubt, in a very short time.

Mr. KENYON. What reason or justice is there in exempting those bonds from taxation and not exempting what we term liberty loan bonds?

Mr. SMOOT. I will answer the Senator very frankly. Because of the fact that Congress was appealing to the farmers of the country, and for that reason the bonds were exempted. I think that is the proper way to answer the question, and I think I ought to answer it just exactly in that way.

Mr. KENYON. It did not really help the farmers particularly, did it? It helped those who wanted to buy a tax-exempt bond.

Mr. SMOOT. It certainly will help the man who buys the bond. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. KENYON. And it will keep on affecting the liberty bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything else I desire to say, unless the Senator wants to ask me a further question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I wanted to say just a word myself.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will yield just a moment, I will add that one of the bills that we passed—I forget the date—provided a revolving fund of \$500,000,000. The Senator will remember that right after that bill was passed our 4½ per cent bonds advanced from about \$95 up to about \$98 on the hundred; but then the sales began in such large quantities that they soon drove down the price of the bonds. If the Government should undertake to buy all the bonds that were offered, it would bankrupt the Government immediately, just as the Senator from North Carolina has said; but we provided that revolving fund, thinking that perhaps a purchase of bonds at some critical time would tend to stabilize the price of the bonds. I do not know but that it has done so; but the \$500,000,000 is a mere bagatelle when you take into consideration the vast quantities of bonds that are passing daily in transactions of commerce in this country.

I will say that a great many of the advertisements come from stockbrokers. The stockbroking business to-day is unprofitable. There is very little transfer of stocks in any part of the United States. Thousands of stockbrokers are failing all over the United States, and those that are living are living from hand to mouth. If they can make one-sixteenth of 1 per cent upon transactions in liberty bonds, they are just that much ahead; and they are trying to maintain their business until better times come through the transfer and purchase of these liberty bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I shall send this RECORD to my constituent. It probably will not bring him very much consolation.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will not the Senator also send to his constituent the votes on the different appropriations that are going on in Congress? That ought to interest him, too, I am sure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He will acquaint himself with the aggregate amount of our appropriations, anyhow. As I say, it will not give him very much consolation. We have had practically a confession here that it is impossible for the Government to take care of the situation that I have described, and that the writer of this letter has described to me. I do not like us to take a position of that kind.

The Senator from Utah says that if all the obligations of the Government were presented for redemption at once it would bankrupt the Government. I think I know enough about finance to agree with him in that statement; but that is not what is proposed to be done at all. It is suggested that a special fund be created to redeem bonds under particular conditions, and the proof of particular conditions. Now, I admit that that would be hard to work out. I admit that if the bonds were selling on the market at \$95, and if they knew that in case a certain showing were made to the Government they would be redeemed at par, an attempt would be made to get these bonds in the hands of people who could comply with those conditions; but, Mr. President, our people are not all perjurers. They are not all people who would try to defraud the Government or deceive the Government. I believe that if a fund were provided under which bonds to the amount of, say, \$500—I do not mean \$100 bonds—could be presented to the Treasury and redeemed at par upon proof that the person presenting the bonds was the original purchaser of the bonds—not an assignee but the original purchaser of the bonds—and that it was necessary for him to secure money to take care of distressing conditions, and that was the reason why the bonds are presented for redemption, there would not be a flood upon the Treasury under such circumstances, with stringent rules. I am merely suggesting an outline, of course.

Of course, it may be, upon mature consideration, that that could not be worked out; but it does seem to me that we ought to try to do something to work out this situation and take care of it. This revolving fund only benefits the man with money. He is the only one that gets any benefit from the revolving fund that we have had, except the reflex action upon the bonds. They go into the public bond market and buy bonds from brokers—from men who are able to carry the bonds. These men probably want to sell their bonds in order to get money to invest. I am not interested in those people. I am interested, of course, in our bonds and in our obligations; and I should like to see some fund or some way provided, or an attempt made to provide it, under which the men who bought these \$50 or \$100 bonds by skimping and saving and denying themselves can now, when stress comes upon them, go to the Government and get the face of the bonds, instead of having to go to some broker or banker and dispose of the bonds at a large discount.

I hope we will not stand here confessing that we can not do anything to meet that situation. I hope a serious attempt will

be made by the proper committees and by the Secretary of the Treasury to suggest some plan under which the situation can be met.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I am very glad he brought up this matter. It is one that ought to receive very serious consideration; and I have no doubt the Senator's remarks this afternoon may lead to some reflection that may eventuate in some scheme that will be helpful.

I want to say to the Senator, however, that I do not recall and I do not think that there is, a single country among the belligerents whose war bonds are to-day selling for par. The same fate befell the war bonds of England and France and Italy and Germany that has befallen our war bonds. As the Senator from Massachusetts says, of course these bonds were issued under very extraordinary circumstances. They were taken by our people, however, in a spirit of patriotism, with full knowledge at the time they were taken—except in the case of the first issue—that bonds previously issued of the same character, with the same rate of interest, were selling below par. I do not know now exactly what was the price of our liberty bonds of the second and third issues at the time of our last liberty-bond sale—

Mr. SMOOT. Ninety-seven and something.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that it was 97 and something, a little bit higher than they are now; but every purchaser of one of the last issue of liberty bonds bought them with full knowledge of the fact that they were not worth par in the open market; and so, if we are to have another issue of those bonds every purchaser will buy them with full knowledge that they are not worth par in the open market. As long as the spirit of patriotism in this country is sufficiently alive to make a flotation of these bonds possible under those conditions we will continue to sell our issues, but when that spirit disappears and these bonds have to be sold upon a commercial basis, of course you can not float them at 100 cents on the dollar with the knowledge that they will not, as soon as purchased, be worth that much money.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has very correctly said, there is but one complete remedy for that situation. What the Senator suggests would give some relief to a certain class of bondholders, and it may be that there is a certain class that is entitled to special consideration and for whom some relief provision ought to be adopted. But, Mr. President, the only way in which we can be assured that these bonds will maintain their value in the market at the price at which they are sold by the Government is either by the extension of the exemption from taxation now allowed by law, or by an increase in the interest rate. That, I think, is pretty generally understood in this country, and the question is, Are we ready to further exempt bonds from taxation, and are we ready to further increase the rate of interest?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, since the discussion of this afternoon I telephoned to the War Department to ascertain the number of soldiers in the United States at the time of the signing of the armistice and how many had been discharged. The statements made here in debate almost made it appear that the officers of the Army and the Secretary of War were willfully negligent in the work of demobilizing the Army. Why, it seems to me that anyone who knows Secretary Baker, and knows of his tremendous energy—that he works day and night—will agree that it does not seem fair or right that he and the officers under him should be condemned when they are doing the very best that can be done, and are making a record that is most commendable in effecting the discharge of the soldiers.

Mr. President, I inquired how many soldiers had been discharged from cantonments and Army posts in the United States, and was informed that there had been discharged up to to-day 1,156,000, and that the number in the United States on November 11, 1918, was 1,676,510. Thus, from two-thirds to three-fourths of the soldiers that were in the cantonments and fortifications and forts of the United States at the time of the surrender of the Germans have been discharged by the War Department.

I will ask any fair Senator whether that is not a remarkable record. You must remember that it takes time to discharge men. They have to be examined; a certain number that are in hospitals can not be released; it takes time to make the physical examinations of millions of men by a limited number of physicians; it takes time to prepare the data for the permanent record the Government must keep of each soldier.

I asked how many soldiers had been transported from France since the 11th day of November, 1918, and the answer was given that 232,000 had arrived in the United States, and that 60,000 are now at sea bound for American ports. The war came

to an end very suddenly. The United States was not prepared to transport its soldiers. We lacked the number of vessels that were necessary for that purpose. We have been unable to get either France or Great Britain to furnish ships for the purpose of transporting soldiers. Now, Mr. President, when we consider the fact that Great Britain has soldiers from Australia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, soldiers from Canada and India that must be returned, you can readily see that she is pretty well occupied with her own returning soldiers, and that consequently her ships are very largely used for that purpose.

Mr. President, we find also that these other nations are engaged in similar tasks, in service which they regard absolutely necessary and essential. When Senators say that the War Department is asleep when it has demobilized two-thirds or three-fourths of the Army in the United States and has demobilized the troops in France at as rapid a rate as it is possible to transport them to our shores, it seems to me that they are indulging in criticism that is unfair, and they are not giving credit to men who are trying to do their duty.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator tell me why we still have in the camps in the United States approximately three-quarters of a million men?

Mr. SHAFROTH. We have not that number.

Mr. REED. When was it reduced below that number?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The number that have been discharged up to to-day, according to a telephone message from Gen. March's office in the War Department, is 1,156,000 men.

Mr. REED. How many does that leave?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That leaves 560,000 men.

Mr. REED. What are those half million men doing in camp all this time?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it takes time to discharge men. They are discharged after an examination. Many of them are sick and can not be discharged now.

Mr. REED. Oh, but, Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to say that these are sick men?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not say that all of them are. There are certain numbers on the sick list. Many of those who have passed the physical examination have been released.

Mr. REED. Yes; many of them have gone, but 500,000 of them are still here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is true; but, nevertheless, the proportion of those that are sick is larger among those who remain than among those who went. Now, as I said to the Senator, it takes time to demobilize men. It took a great many months to demobilize the men in the Civil War. The great parade of the soldiers of the Union in this city did not take place until months after the surrender of Lee at Appomattox. It requires a large number of men to remain at cantonments, forts, and camps to guard and keep them in good condition until complete demobilization has taken place and until Congress determines what we will do with our cantonments.

We have had criticism continually. The War Department has done nothing that was right, according to some. No matter what is done, it is wrong; and yet I make the statement that no nation on earth ever made the preparations for war that the United States did with greater dispatch nor transported to a foreign country the number of men that the United States landed in France in so short a time.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the work that was done. I want to show just what has been the record in transporting our soldiers to France. There was a great deal of discussion here in the past about the slowness of the War Department in transporting troops overseas. Morning after morning Senators would ask, Why do we not get the men over to France? Why do we not get them on the firing line?

I have a comparison between Great Britain's action and the action of the United States. Here are the figures: In the first period of the war, from the 14th day of August, 1914, until the 1st day of January, 1915, England sent to France only 480,000 men. From that time until the 1st day of January, 1916, England sent to France only a sufficient additional number of men to make a total of 1,000,000. There was nearly a year and a half that England, presumably much better prepared for war than we were, had spent in getting across the channel of a few miles into France only 1,000,000 soldiers. By the 1st of January, 1917, the total number of soldiers that Great Britain had transported to France was but 1,500,000, and by January 1, 1918, the total number she had landed there was 2,000,000 men.

Look at the record of the United States. I warrant that no one can say but that the record of the War Department in the preparation for war and in the transportation of soldiers to Europe has been far better than that of any other nation in the history of the world—far better than that of Great Britain.

The war started between the United States and Germany on the 6th day of April, 1917, and from that time until the 11th day of November, 1918, the United States transported and landed in France about 2,000,000 men. I can give you the exact number. The total number of men transported was 2,002,175. Not in four years, not in three years, but in one year and a half the United States Government had collected these soldiers, drilled them, provided transportation for them, and had landed them in France. Is there any record of any nation in the history of the world equals that in preparation for war?

When you remember that for the first year and a half Great Britain transported to France only 1,000,000 men, you can readily see that in our year and a half we have doubled the record of Great Britain, which had a passage of only 42 miles crossing the Channel in order to land her soldiers in France, while we had a distance to traverse of more than 3,000 miles.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I will answer the question if I can.

Mr. REED. While England had landed only 1,000,000 men actually in France, how many million had she trained in her own country?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suppose quite a number, but she never took all of them over.

Mr. REED. Oh, well, but as a matter of fact had not she trained a greater army than she had sent to France, and was she not simply holding that army in her own country for the finishing touches?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not think so. I think she was holding some, and she was, of course, training soldiers. But, Mr. President, so was the United States. The very fact that on the 11th of November, 1918, at the time of the signing of the armistice, we had in the United States in the cantonments and in the forts and other places 1,676,510 men shows that we were training men also and did not have time to transport them in that short period of time.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator, of course, is discussing an entirely different question than that which I discussed. I said nothing about demobilization of the Army. That is no answer to the fact that you are not getting men back home as soon as you should to say you got them over as quickly as you ought to. But I wish to call the Senator's attention—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to remind the Senator that I have been answering criticisms which have been made, and which I say have been made principally upon the other side of the aisle, to the effect that there has been delay in nearly everything the War Department undertook; and it is a record that is much better than that of any department in any government that ever prepared armies for war.

Mr. REED. I wish that were true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If you will allow me to put these figures in I will show it is true.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator a question about his figures. Of course, anybody can make up figures when he starts to get a result. I wish to know if it is not true that England, with her population—I am speaking about England, Ireland, and Scotland; Great Britain we will call that to contradistinguish it from the British Empire—had not raised, equipped, and trained and had ready there at the front, or ready for the front, only a few miles away, an army millions greater than the figures which the Senator has given?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will say to the Senator that she did have some men in England. There is no doubt about that; just as we had 1,600,000 men in the United States at the close of the war. There is no doubt in the wide world but that the speed and the expedition with which these men were put to the front by England was slow compared to that which the United States developed in transporting 3,000 miles every soldier that we landed in France.

I will state to the Senator, with respect to these figures, that they have been compiled by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, and they show the exact number of men that were enlisted and the number of men that were transported. They show the manner in which the various departments furnishing supplies had complied with the speed orders that were urged.

Mr. REED. Does that show that we had enough shells on the front?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, you can not declare war on the 6th day of April and expect to have manufactured and shipped all the necessary materials, especially when it was necessary in many cases to build factories for their manufacture, and expect to deliver them in time for a battle six months thereafter. That would be a physical impossibility.

Mr. REED. The Senator said these figures showed the system used in a way that led me to believe that we had performed something marvelous. I am not here criticizing and do not want to get him into that line of discussion, but I will say to the Senator that if he is undertaking to demonstrate to the country that we sent our men into battle fully prepared and equipped, he had better keep away from that question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I think the records are accurate. They have been compiled very carefully.

Mr. REED. I will show you Gen. Pershing's telegram in a few moments.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to show the Senate just what we did. The Army in Europe on the 11th day of November, 1918, amounted to 2,002,175. In the States we had 1,676,510; in the Insular possessions and in Alaska we had 55,735; a grand total in our Army, excluding marines, of 3,707,132; including the marines the grand total was 3,734,420.

Mr. President, England had perhaps between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 men. I do not believe that they had more than that, if they had that number. We raised ours in 18 months and sent 2,000,000 of them to France 3,000 miles away, while England took four years and three months to raise her army and had in France at the time of the surrender 2,000,000 men.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, however, will admit that with all the men we sent to Europe England transported over 60 per cent of them?

Mr. SHAFROTH. England did transport a great many; there is no doubt about that. We did not have the vessels. But England was very anxious then to get them over. She was much more anxious at that time to get them over and save her forces there than she is now to get them back.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator states is absolutely true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no doubt about that, and we can not get ships on that account.

Mr. SMOOT. But we could have done so if the resolution that was offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and upon which he delivered a speech in the Senate and which was finally referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and lies there now perfectly dead—

Mr. SHAFROTH. What is it?

Mr. SMOOT. A resolution that there should be an agreement between this country and England that she would grant to the United States the same shipping facilities after the war to get our men back into this country that she offered to get them over to France.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That shows great foresight on the part of the Senator from Iowa, and perhaps it ought to have been considered; but if it was not taken up it was the fault of Congress, it was not the fault of the Secretary of War.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know about that; I will not say that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There might have been said, if we had passed that resolution, that we were delaying the sending of troops over there.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. SHAFROTH. One can criticize anything that is done, I care not what it is. Right now the contention was made in the early part of the discussion to the effect that President Wilson is delaying the soldiers coming back by negotiating for a league of nations to prevent future wars instead of only fixing the terms of peace in a treaty.

When Senators criticize that effort they are criticizing not only the President of the United States but they are criticizing every Government that is at the peace table. Is it possible that the President ought to have interposed an objection to try to establish a permanent peace when all the powers seemed willing and anxious to make provisions to prevent future wars? Senators must remember that when they criticize that fact they are criticizing every one of our allies, because every one of them wanted this league of nations determined upon before there was a treaty of peace outlined. Everybody knows that if we do not get a league of nations before we get the treaty signed, we never will be able to get Germany into any such league. We can force her now by reason of the fact that in the settlement of the peace terms we can make those terms absolute. When it is announced that the President of the United States urges a league of nations to prevent wars, critics say then that the cause of the delay in bringing our troops home is the President. Oh, yes, it is the President that is delaying demobilization, when, as a matter of fact, the

force that was most insistent upon a league of nations was the Government of Great Britain, even more so than the United States.

The Senator from Missouri has suggested that America is simply one nation and that we are to be in a league with eight foreign Governments, and that therefore these eight foreign nations might be against our one, our own Government. What could Great Britain say? The representatives of Great Britain could say, We have India; we have Canada; we have various other possessions with populations amounting to five times as much as that of the United States. We find ourselves in the condition of being one nation in a league with eight foreign nations; the eight might be against Great Britain.

If you are going to be controlled by an argument of that kind, you can never have a league of nations. It is impossible to have one, because each one will say, "We have to yield something and therefore we will not go in," and this war with all its horrors, with its tragic losses both in life and in property is liable to be precipitated again by a trivial incident such as the killing of an archduke. Can it be wrong for nations to agree that they will stand together in preventing war?

I never believed that there were people who would object to peace, to a permanent peace. It was that for which we declared throughout the liberty bond campaigns. The burden of our speeches was that this was a war to end all wars, and now we find objection to even moral suasion being used for the purpose of preventing war. Every time one of us made a statement in behalf of liberty bond subscriptions we emphasized that this is a humane war; this is a war of unselfishness on our part; it is a war to save civilization, it is a war to prevent the recurrence of these horrors; and now we find Senators ready to object to any kind of agreement that will put into the treaty some kind of a stipulation that will prevent war or even have a tendency to prevent war.

Mr. President, we may not get the strongest league of nations, but I am in favor of a league of nations, even if there is but one clause contained in its constitution, a declaration that each nation agrees to respect the territorial boundaries of the nations as they exist at the time of the signing of the treaty, and that they are to aid all of the nations in maintaining the same.

We should go further and use our power for the purpose of preventing invasion of any territory of any nation unless the aggressor submits the controversy to a court of arbitration.

If we are able to get only that agreement, we have something that will stop nine-tenths of the wars of the world, because nine-tenths of the wars are for conquest, nine-tenths of the wars are for the purpose of grabbing territory, and if you once obtain an agreement that no nation can invade another, that no nation can take from another any part of its territory, the incentive or inducement for war will cease.

Mr. President, I have been diverted from these figures, and I wish to call attention to them because they show a remarkable record not only as to the troops which were embarked and transported but also as to the manufacture and shipment of war supplies. We began to transport our soldiers in American ships in May, 1917, and we increased the number until in June, 1918, we transported during that month in American bottoms 115,903 of our American soldiers. At the same time we were using the British tonnage and vessels of the other allies.

The total number of soldiers transported in American ships during the war was 896,449. The number transported in British ships was 1,047,374; the number in French ships, 48,691; the number in Italian ships, 61,608.

Mr. President, after the declaration of war we had to pass through both bodies of Congress conscription laws which were long and vigorously fought. We had to give considerable time for the eligible men to register for service. We had to list the 10,000,000 eligible men and give time for the claiming of exemptions and deferred classifications. We had to train the men for actual service by months of drilling. We had to construct enormous cantonments, to build ships, to manufacture guns, artillery, munitions of war, and clothing in gigantic quantities. When we take into consideration all these matters, and the speed with which they were put into the service, ready for fighting upon the battle line, it makes a most remarkable record. There were 2,056,122 of our soldiers transported.

I wish to call attention to other things the War Department has done. The cargoes that were sent to the American Expeditionary Forces from April, 1917, to November 1, 1918, in short tons to the supply service are as follows: I find that there were shipped to France in the Quartermaster's supplies 2,149,400 tons; in engineers' supplies, 1,314,300 tons; in ordnance supplies, 989,900 tons; in the Signal Service, 115,500 tons; in medicinal supplies, 88,900 tons; in the mortar transportation, 113,300 tons;

in the aviation department, 51,400 tons; in Red Cross supplies, 31,900 tons; in the miscellaneous, 43,000 tons; making a total of the shipments of supplies by the War Department to France of 4,897,600 tons.

Is not that a great record? The war came upon us suddenly; the war ended suddenly; and the result of these shipments and the preparation and manufacturing and getting ready of the same is the most remarkable record in the history of the world.

Mr. President, in some of the instances they had to go into the forests and find the spruce and cut it green and season it, and then had to manufacture it into the shapes that they needed. Is it possible that men can fairly say that it should not take time to do those things; that men who worked day and night for the accomplishment of the same should be condemned?

Mr. President, if officials are to be held to account in the degree suggested by the criticism offered here we should require the services of one having the magic of Alladin with his wonderful lamp who can create in an instant great armies and enormous supplies.

I wish also to call attention to something else that was done. Here is the production of munitions for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. Here were the complete units that were manufactured:

Artillery in complete units, 75-millimeter guns, 932; 3-inch, 75 millimeter AA guns, 97. I shall not read the whole list, but I will get the total. The total is 1,647 cannon that were produced in the United States for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not mean to say that these 75-millimeter guns were made in this country, does he?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am showing the complete units of these that were made.

Mr. SMOOT. In the United States?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In the United States, production of munitions in the United States for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How many?

Mr. SHAFROTH. One thousand six hundred and forty-seven.

Here is a list of the complete rounds that were manufactured in the gun factories and in the munition factories of the United States. I shall give the total. These include those for the 75-millimeter guns and for all the artillery. We find that there were 17,203,000 complete rounds for the artillery of the United States that were sent to France.

We had other factories at work; we had other things to do; and the same War Department that seems not to be able to do anything to suit some people, Mr. President, has manufactured of helmets, 1,975,000; of machine guns, 130,000; of machine rifles, 52,000; of rifles, 2,507,000; of pistols and revolvers, 666,000; of rifle and machine-gun ammunition, 2,879,000,000 rounds; of pistol ammunition, 328,000,000 rounds.

Oh, the War Department was sleeping; it was doing nothing; it was absolutely oblivious to the necessity of getting our troops over to France!

Of tractors, it built 32,409; of tanks, 69; of smokeless powder, it manufactured 198,000,000 pounds; of TNT, 101,000,000 pounds; of ammonium nitrate, 91,000,000 pounds; of picric acid, 37,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, the War Department had other duties to perform. It had to ship and deliver ordnance materials to the American Expeditionary Forces. Here is a statement showing the total amount of complete units that were shipped up to November 15, 1918. There were 454 cannon shipped to our forces; there were British and French deliveries to November 11 of 3,091; a total of 3,545. The amount of artillery ammunition, in complete rounds for the artillery, was 9,066,420.

For the other ordnance the total is not mentioned, but of rifles there were shipped 1,800,000; of pistols and revolvers, 615,000; of machine guns, 49,350; and of machine rifles there were 38,000 shipped.

The rifle ammunition which was shipped was 1,629,300,000 rounds; of pistol and revolver ammunition there were shipped 233,848,000 rounds. Many grenades, tanks, and tractors were also delivered.

Mr. President, they were somewhat busy in doing those things. I want now to state the production of munitions in the United States for Great Britain and for France which were sent over to those countries by the United States:

For Great Britain, field guns, complete units of 361 in the artillery and of extra guns 216.

The limbers and vehicles delivered were 278 in number.

For France there were shipped 70 of the complete units, 525 extra guns, 50 extra carriages, 70 limbers and vehicles.

In artillery ammunition the amounts that were shipped to Great Britain were 3,568,001 rounds; for machinings 2,888,840. Complete rounds for the artillery, 3,577,040 rounds.

Yet the War Department was asleep!

Mr. President, we find that the airplanes which were made between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, were as follows:

Combat De Haviland fours, 3,227.

Combat Handley-Paige, 101.

Training—elementary, 5,346.

Training—advanced, 2,474.

Making a total of 11,148 airplanes which were shipped overseas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Just a moment. Those were the figures of production. Of those shipped overseas, the first were 1,985.

Mr. REED. What were they?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They were combat De Haviland fours. Combat Handley-Paige (parts), 100; training—elementary, 0; training—advanced, 0; making a total of 1,985.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me finish the figures in regard to the engines, and then I will yield to the Senator. There were produced of combat—Liberty motors, 13,554; shipped overseas, 4,388. Combat—Hispano, 469; shipped overseas, 245. Training—elementary engines, 10,568; shipped overseas, 0. Training—advance, 5,221; shipped overseas, 200; making a total product in the United States between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, of 29,832, and shipped overseas, 4,828.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely desire to know if the War Department has furnished those figures to the Senator as an actual representation of the airplane situation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. At the time of November 11, 1918; yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I charge that they are deliberately misleading as to the facts.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know about that.

Mr. REED. I charge that the investigation made by the Military Committee made an absolute demonstration that up to the time the war closed our airplane program was a substantial failure. I am sorry to have to say this. I have made no attack upon the War Department except for failure to bring back our soldiers; but I say to the Senator from Colorado that if the War Department has the insolence to send figures of that kind here in regard to the airplane situation it needs checking up, and it will get it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The airplane program, which was made the subject of debate in this body, was behind in April, May, and June of last year because an immense amount of work had to be done by way of preparation. Factories had to be erected, railroads built to the forests; they had to cut the spruce timber green in the forests, to season it, and then to manufacture it into forms. All that takes time, and of course they could not have, and did not have at that time, the number which we anticipated and hoped they would have; but that shows no inefficiency; it merely shows they were behind in their contracts; it shows, as a matter of fact, that they were doing good work.

Mr. President, I want show another thing which the War Department has done. I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri, whose reference was only to the bringing back of the soldiers, that the equipping of the soldiers has been criticized in this body almost continually. I have some data here with reference to the United States squadrons at the front. A squadron is equipped with from 15 to 25 airplanes. On April 30, 1918, we had 3; on May 31, we had 12; on June 30, 1918, we had 13; on July 31, 1918, we had 14; on August 31 we had 26; on September 30 we had 32; on October 31 we had 43; and on November 11, 1918, we had 45.

A comparison of enemy planes brought down by the United States forces and United States planes brought down by enemy forces will show that the United States planes lost to the enemy were 271, while the enemy planes lost to the United States numbered 491. That shows a record of efficiency on the part of our soldiers which was more than twice that of the German Army, which had been supposed to be, and has been heralded to be, the most expert, the best equipped, and the most perfect military organization in the world.

Mr. President, there was something else done by the War Department. I refer to railroad transportation equipment produced and shipped to the American Expeditionary Forces from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. Of standard-gauge locomotives there were produced 1,691. Does it not take some time to build locomotives? Of that number there were shipped overseas, 1,141. Of narrow-gauge locomotives 445 were pro-

duced, and 406 were shipped overseas. Of standard-gauge cars 19,516 were manufactured and 16,372 shipped overseas. It takes time to manufacture cars; it takes time to construct locomotives; it takes time to make cars of both narrow-gauge and standard-gauge pattern. Yet we did all this in 18 months, without any preparation whatever.

As to automobile transportation, of two-wheel-drive trucks, 55,563 were produced and 30,417 were shipped overseas in 18 months. It takes time to make automobiles and it takes time to transport them 3,000 miles from our shores. It takes time to get them from the factory to the seaboard, especially in view of the fact that the railroads of this country were congested to such an extent that the shipments could not get to the port of departure without long delay; yet it is said that we were sleeping on our job.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator mean now to argue that we are entitled to any glorious record on account of trucks? Let me read a telegram from Gen. Pershing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On account of what?

Mr. REED. On account of trucks.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. REED. The telegram to which I refer is as follows:

OCTOBER 13.

Subparagraph (a)—

Failure to float reconnaissance and staff observation cars, to fill tonnage allotment, resulting in improper equipment of regiments and uneconomical diversion of passenger vehicles urgently needed for other purposes. Vehicles should be available and tonnage allotted, but only 55 reconnaissance cars and 75 staff observation cars arrived or were reported by ships during September and October. Please cable prospect for balance for October and November.

Failure to float light repair trucks greatly handicapped repair ordnance work. General motor transport situation does not permit diverting other transports for this purpose. Two hundred and sixty-four reported shipped in August and others presumably available. Tonnage allotments made and total arrivals or reported by ships to date, only 114.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I really do not see any criticism in that, except that they were in a hurry and, of course, anybody who needs equipment of any kind is anxious to get it. That is simply a request to have it expedited.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator see any criticism in the statement of the shortage? Does he see any criticism in this—

On account of the nonarrival of motor transport and animals as heretofore requested, our situation with respect to animal transport is becoming increasingly and alarmingly serious.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be true, but England had been in the war for four years trying to do things, and her supplies were short also.

Mr. REED. But the Senator has just been arguing that everything was supplied; and when I start to read him of a serious shortage, he replies that England was also short. Now, what does the Senator say to this one line? I presume he will also reply that England did something—

Unless supplies are furnished when cabled for, our armies will cease to operate.

PERSHING.

Does that sound very encouraging?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President, of course we were anxious to get our soldiers over there, and no doubt Gen. Pershing was also; and, as shown by the statement I have here, the number of soldiers we transported overseas from April to November amounted, in the respective months, to 117,244, 277,000, 306,000, 281,000, 251,000, 174,000, and 30,000. Of course, if Gen. Pershing had stated, "I want 5,000,000 troops," we could not have forwarded them; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. I was not talking about troops.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, the same thing is true as to supplies. They have to be manufactured; it is necessary to have the bottoms in which to ship them; many things have to be done, and, unless a person knows the exact situation, he can not appreciate the magnitude of the undertaking.

Mr. REED. I know that some things were done, and some things were not done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes.

Mr. REED. What I am replying to is this pretense of the department that they have done everything so marvelously well; and, when I show that there was a shortage, the Senator replies that England perhaps did not do as well. That is hardly an answer.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, it is an answer, because all things are relative; there is no doubt about that. If a demand is made for something before it can be obtained or manufactured, it is absurd to say that there is negligence on the part of anybody for not immediately sending it.

Mr. REED. The Senator claims that they performed their duty perfectly—

Mr. SHAFROTH. No.

Mr. REED. And then, when it is shown that it was performed imperfectly he says that everything is imperfect.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I mean to say that their undertakings were more nearly perfect than similar undertakings of any other nation that ever attempted such a task.

Now, Mr. President, as to four-wheel drive trucks, the number produced in the United States was 16,934, and the number shipped overseas, 9,420. Of ambulances there were 10,893 produced, and 6,981 shipped overseas. Of motor cars 17,666 were produced, and 6,989 shipped overseas. Of motorcycles 28,310 were produced, and 16,188 shipped overseas.

Mr. President, the War Department had also other duties to perform, and I wish to call attention to some of them. Here is the list of "Clothing and equipage stocks overseas November 1, 1918":

Stocks on hand in France and days' supply based on Gen. Pershing's new automatic allowances, effective November 1, 1918:

Number of blankets in United States, 4,294,000. Stock overseas, 1,119,000.

Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas in blankets, 425; in jerkins, 159 days.

Coats, stock in United States, 3,991,000. Stock overseas, 1,419,000.

Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas, 154.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know that a great many of those were made by Spain and England and France?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; not those that were shipped overseas.

Mr. SMOOT. They were overseas, it is true; but the Senator knows that we have spent now about \$30,000,000,000, and we certainly ought to get something for that \$30,000,000,000; and the Senator must know, if he knows where that clothing for overseas service was made, that a great part of it was made in England and Spain and France.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The criticism has been continual—

Mr. SMOOT. I am not criticizing at all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator has been giving a thrust once in a while; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. But when the Senator stands up here and gives the Senate information, and leads them to believe that all these things were made in the United States, I can not agree with him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I read the title as to what this was.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And this is what I say the War Department reports under that title.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt that they had those things on hand, but American money purchased them from foreign countries.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, certainly American money paid for them. We pay for our things. If we had had a shortage of a few blankets, we would have heard something from Senators upon that subject. If we had had a shortage of coats, we would have heard Senators, in a chorus of denunciation, proclaiming against the stupidity of the War Department. I do not know where the articles came from, but I do know they were there, and they were ready for the service of the soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator really invites criticism, I could say to him that it could be based upon the very things that the Senator has just mentioned; but I am not criticizing. What I wanted to do was to give the Government all the money that could possibly be spent, and I wanted them to get the goods wherever they could get them in the world; but I do not want credit given where credit is not due.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The heading of this was read. It gives this statement:

Clothing and equipage stocks overseas November 1, 1918.

Stocks on hand in France and days' supply based on Gen. Pershing's new automatic allowances effective November 1, 1918.

Now, whether they were purchased in Spain or whether they were purchased in the United States, I do not know; but we know that a great many were purchased in the United States.

We find that in the case of drawers the stock in the United States was 15,746,000, which must have been made in America, and the stock overseas was 5,304,000, enough to supply the Army in France for 202 days.

I do not want to go through all of this list of supplies purchased by the War Department for the Army.

In the supply of stockings, there were in the United States 16,290,000 pairs, and 8,753,000 pairs were overseas.

In the stock of coats, 4,142,000 were made, and 2,141,000 were in stock overseas.

This includes all of the furnishings and stock on hand, both for the soldiers in the cantonments and the soldiers in France.

There were 8,850,000 pairs of shoes in stock in the United States, and 2,033,000 pairs overseas. That shows evidently

that there were manufactured in the United States at least 6,000,000 pairs of shoes, because that is the total stock now in the United States; and if you take that comparison you will find that very few of these goods, compared to the total manufactured in the United States, were manufactured in foreign countries. England had soldiers to supply. Spain did not; but Spain is not a great manufacturing country.

In the case of gloves, there were 3,734,000 pairs in stock in the United States, and 2,682,000 overseas.

In the case of overcoats, the stock in the United States was 3,691,000, and the stock overseas was 477,000.

In the case of raincoats, the stock in the United States was 1,620,000 and 550,000 overseas.

Winter undershirts, 13,806,000.

Mittens, 3,070,000.

Caps, 2,931,000.

As to diseases in the Army, I saw an account in a newspaper the other day showing by far the smallest percentage of deaths among our soldiers compared to the deaths from disease in the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, notwithstanding the fact that the most fatal epidemic known for centuries had existed during the last six months of the war.

Mr. President, such is part of the record of the War Department, and it demonstrates that there is no comparison between what the United States has done in the period of one year and a half and the results shown by other nations covering a much longer period of time.

I have always felt that when officers of the Government are endeavoring earnestly to do their duty, when they are working day and night for the success of this great war, they should not be subjected to the condemnation and the criticisms which have been made concerning their actions. No man is perfect; no man can do everything in the short time that is available for preparation for a great war; but we do know that here is a record giving each particular item, and I challenge comparison with any other nation as against that which was done by our own United States. This applies not only to the Secretary of War, whose record has been phenomenal, but it applies to all the other departments that have bent their energies toward the success of this great victory which we have achieved in behalf of liberty and civilization.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In behalf of the War Department, let me say that we have nine days more of this session of Congress. We have 14 supply bills necessary to pass to run the Government. The Army bill came over here this morning. Unless we make some progress, there will be no money with which to run the War Department in any way. Now, I was very much interested in the figures that the Senator read; but those bulletins from the War Department have come down here regularly for the last six months, and I was going to make this suggestion in order that we might pass the appropriation bills that are necessary to take care of the Army.

The Navy Department have a very good provision in the legislative bill. They provide an appropriation for the Navy to write its own history of this war. It might be well for those interested in the War Department to supplement that appropriation by providing an amount for the War Department to write its own history, instead of sending in bulletins; and then we might get right down to business and pass the appropriation bills.

I want to suggest to those who are interested in the War Department that we might compromise this matter, so that we could attend to business, by providing for an appropriation to authorize the War Department to write its own history; and I shall be very glad to accept that amendment, if the Senator or somebody else interested will offer it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I am one of the Members of this body who very seldom occupy the attention of the Senate. I never make a long speech. I have spoken about an hour, and the tirade against the administration occupied from 15 minutes of 1 o'clock until 15 minutes of 5 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I assure the Senator that I am not discussing him in this connection. I am talking about the bulletins that come down here. This is only one of a number.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; that may be. I had no intention of speaking to-day or at any other time upon this subject; but while Senators were laying emphasis upon the large numbers of soldiers in cantonments and the lack of excuse for not releasing them I went to the telephone and obtained the exact number; and the real facts, which, added to the information contained in this document made up by the War Department, show a record of efficiency that is marvelous, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks in the Record the tables to which I referred.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clothing and equipage stocks overseas, Nov. 1, 1918.

STOCKS ON HAND IN FRANCE AND DAYS' SUPPLY BASED ON GEN. PERSHING'S NEW AUTOMATIC ALLOWANCES, EFFECTIVE NOV. 1, 1918.

	Stock in United States.	Stock overseas.	Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas.
Blankets.....	4,294,000	1,119,000	425
Drawers, winter.....	15,746,000	5,304,000	202
Jerkins.....	1,405,000	1,044,000	139
Coats, denim.....	3,991,000	1,419,000	154
Puttees, woolen.....	5,231,000	3,356,000	149
Trousers, denim.....	3,374,000	1,842,000	140
Boots, rubber, hip.....	1,193,000	551,000	140
Shirts, flannel.....	6,710,000	3,033,000	135
Stockings, wool, heavy.....	16,293,000	8,753,000	134
Coats, wool.....	4,142,000	2,141,000	125
Shoes, field.....	8,850,000	2,033,000	103
Gloves, wool.....	3,734,000	2,682,000	82
Paulins.....	38,000	21,000	80
Breeches and trousers, wool.....	6,791,000	1,789,000	75
Overcoats.....	3,691,000	477,000	73
Raincoats.....	1,620,000	550,000	59
Undershirts, winter.....	13,806,000	1,231,000	55
Mittens, leather.....	3,070,000	664,000	51
Caps, overseas.....	2,931,000	189,000	14

PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3797) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. I ask leave that the reading of the amendments may be dispensed with. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt the Senator from Montana in reference to this particular bill, but there is an appropriation bill before the Senate which was reported some days ago, and it has been before the Senate the entire day and no progress has been made on it.

Mr. MYERS. This is just a request for a conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I expect to move an adjournment at half past 6 o'clock, so that these matters may be taken up in the morning hour to-morrow. There are but nine days left of this session, and I think the Senate ought to give some opportunity for the consideration of the supply bills that it is necessary to have passed.

Mr. MYERS. This will take only a minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I intend to move that the Senate adjourn at half past 6 o'clock, so that Senators may have an opportunity to bring up these matters in the morning hour to-morrow.

Mr. MYERS. But I can not do it then. This has no place in the morning hour. There is no heading of business at all for it. This is a privileged question, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). This is a message from the House and is a privileged communication, as the Chair understands. The Senate has heard the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate refuse to concur in the House amendments and asks for a conference with the House.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF TROOPS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very sorry to take a minute or so, particularly after the remarks of the Senator in charge of this bill; and I think his remarks are entirely justified.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They were not personal at all.

Mr. REED. I know they were not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I simply wanted to proceed with the appropriation bill; that is all.

Mr. REED. In what I said this afternoon I undertook to call attention not to the general shortcomings of the War Department but to the fact that our soldiers are being held in

camp and that they are not being sent home as rapidly as we want them—at least, not as rapidly as some of us want them. I did not undertake a criticism of the way in which the War Department had conducted the war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I did not say that the Senator had. I was criticizing generally the statements that had been made in the last two or three months in this Chamber, principally by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator got me so confused and mixed with Senators on the other side and with the criticism that I confess I could not differentiate between myself and them; but that is all right. The Senator never means to do an injustice to anybody, and I know he would not do one to me.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir.

Mr. REED. But I wish to take a minute to call attention to the fact that every time anybody calls attention to anything that is wrong the cry is always raised, "You are criticizing everything that is done." That is the cloak under which refuge is taken in every case.

Now, I want it understood that the Congress has a right to criticize. It is true that there are a good many men who have lost the power of criticism. There are some men who are under some kind of hypnotic influence that has made it impossible for them to do anything except to exclaim, "Me, too!" to every proposition which comes over to them. They stand in the light of the great white throne of glory, blinded, and they do whatever they are told to do, regardless of their opinions. In fact, they cease to have any opinions. Now, that is just a little nauseating, and I do not wonder that the Congress comes into the contempt of the public and into the contempt of the Executive. I do not think it is the business of Congress to stand here and pick flaws with everything, but neither do I think it is the business of Congress to do nothing but stand here in the attitude of glorification, singing "Te Deum laudamus."

The thing that I want to say at this moment is that I am sorry the War Department is sending out any such mess of figures as it gave here to-day. I am sorry it has resorted to it. There were many good things done in this war; many things were splendidly done; but I will tell you that the best job that was done in this war was not done by the War Department. It was done in the homes of America, where there was raised the best material for soldiers that God ever put on this earth. That job was not done by the War Department. Another thing the War Department did not do: It did not produce the wealth of this country. That was produced by the people.

Now, far be it from me to stand here and harshly criticize. Many things may be praised, but when the War Department sends in figures here, trying to convince this body and the country that every supply was on hand, that everything was just as it ought to be, that it performed miracles, that it had airplanes that darkened the skies, and all that sort of stuff, it is not telling the truth, and it is not reflecting any credit upon itself.

I am going to read a telegram, and I have a lot more like it. I am just going to read it to show how misleading figures can be:

SEPTEMBER 13.

Experience of last three months, during which our tonnage receipts fell far short of our expectations, made it necessary to call attention in most positive terms to conditions which have resulted—

Mr. SMOOT. Was that in 1918?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes.

It has been necessary to place combatant troops in the lines shortly after their arrival in France. Divisions have at intervals been employed in quiet or active sectors according to their degree of training, but all must be employed if we are to reap full advantage of the present favorable situation. In most essential articles of engineer and quartermaster equipment we are over our estimated allotments for June, July, and August, but all other departments are short in percentages figured on a tonnage allotment basis, as follows: Ordnance Department, 33 per cent; Signal Corps, 52 per cent; Chemical Warfare Service, 51 per cent; Medical Corps, 23 per cent; Motor Transport, 81 per cent; and railroad transportation, 20 per cent. At the present time our ability to supply and maneuver our forces depends largely on motor transportation. The shortage in motor transportation is particularly embarrassing, now due to the shortage of horses for our horse-drawn transports. We are able to carry out present plans due to the fact—

Now, notice this—

that we have been able to borrow, temporarily, large numbers of trucks and ambulances from the French. We have also borrowed 15 American ambulance sections from Italy. The shortage of ambulances to move our wounded is critical. Attention is called to our shortage in motor transportation, as contained in our cable 1606, subparagraph A. These shortages have been augmented by troops arriving since that time. In this connection attention is called to the fact that we have already been called upon to equip with motor transportation 8 of the 10 divisions which have come over to us from the British.

We have reached the point where we can no longer improvise or borrow. The most important plans and operations depend upon certainty that the home Government will deliver at French port material

and equipment called for. It is urged that foregoing be given most serious consideration and that tonnage allotted for supply of Army in France be sufficient to deliver material and equipment properly proportioned in kind and amounts to meet the needs of our troops. The need of motor transportation is urgent. It is not understood why greater advantage has not been taken of deck space to ship motor trucks. Trucks do not overburden dock accommodations nor require railroad transportation, which in fact it relieves. Can you not impress this upon shipping authorities?

PERSHING.

Now, I have a stack of these here, and I do not intend to read them, for there is no use encouraging people, but I do not want very much more of this stuff sent over by the War Department or I will read it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say merely one word at this time about the custom that has grown up in the departments here in Washington. There is not a citizen in the United States who does not know that there has been some splendid work done by every one of our departments. We have had some officials in the departments who could not have done better, and no one else could have done more than they did, but there were other officials who were a total failure, and it ill becomes anyone to try to make an excuse for them.

I have noticed of late that if there is a criticism either in the House or in the Senate the same parties who are criticized send up a load of stuff from the departments and get some one to get up in the Senate or the House and read it as an excuse. I think that that practice ought to be stopped. Senators can get all the information they desire at any time they wish it without having some little official down in one of the departments who has been criticized, as soon as he hears about it, send a telephone message up and send a whole lot of stuff to encumber the Record.

I am one who has not uttered a word of criticism in relation to the war and the caring for every department of it, but that does not mean that I do not know that there have been criminal mistakes. That does not mean that I do not know the waste has been indefensible, and the people's money has been squandered by the hundreds of millions of dollars, and there has not been any return from it. My whole thought and idea was to win the war, and I did not care if the head of a department came before the Appropriations Committee and asked for a billion dollars; I did not go into the question as to whether it was all wanted immediately or not; I made the statement upon the floor of the Senate that I was going to vote for all that was asked, and I would hold the administration responsible for the expenditure of the money. The time will come when they will have to answer for it, Mr. President. If it is well spent, the American people will know it, and if it has been squandered in any way the American people will be advised of it.

AMERICAN SHIPPING PROBLEM.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Monday, the 24th instant, I shall present a brief diagnosis of the American shipping problem arising out of the recent world war.

MARKET PRICE OF LIBERTY BONDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to refer for just a moment to the statement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee with reference to liberty bonds. It is a good ways from that in the Record now, but he made one statement that I do not think ought to be passed over without notice. He stated that all those who purchased the 3½ per cent liberty bonds did it knowing that the bonds would go below par.

Mr. President, those who are accustomed to dealing in bonds probably knew that, but in my judgment the great mass of the people who purchased a small amount of bonds—a \$50 bond or a \$100 bond—did not know it. As a matter of fact, men went all over this country stating from public platforms that every man who bought a \$50 bond was simply investing \$50, and he would get that \$50 back with the interest whenever he wanted it. That was uttered by four-minute men all over the country, by representatives of the Government, by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and by the Secretary of the Treasury himself in his trips throughout the country. As I said, the men who are accustomed to deal in bonds probably knew that they would be below par, but the ordinary citizen in purchasing those bonds thought he was getting \$50 worth when he got a \$50 bond.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, bearing upon the point which the Senator from Washington has called to the attention of the Senate, I desire to have the Secretary read a letter which I have received in reference to the bonds and the price at which they are selling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SLAB FORK COAL CO.,
Slab Fork, W. Va., February 17, 1919.

Hon. HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: From the papers I see that Mr. Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, has asked Congress to place before the people in April a so-called victory loan.

I supported four liberty loans and will support the victory loan. But unless either Congress or Secretary Glass does something to raise the liberty bonds scattered about the country to par, I fear we of Raleigh County, W. Va., will have a hard time raising our quota.

The four-minute men and others led the people to believe that bonds were money, and the United States liberty bonds would all be of the same value. Since work has gone to the bad many miners are selling their bonds, and don't understand why a \$50 bond is only worth \$46 or thereabouts. The bond sharks are doing a thriving business. I understand that \$50 bonds have sold at Slab Fork for \$35.

Many business men who subscribed for \$1,000 to \$5,000 of bonds are worried over the market condition of the bonds and are not as enthusiastic about the coming victory loan as we would like to have them. And if this victory loan bond is made so inviting that it will drive the liberties lower on the market I very much fear the mining world will do but little, if anything, in the coming victory drive.

Exempt all liberty bonds from taxes. Give the same rate of interest for liberty bonds and victory bonds and you will restore confidence and invite thrift.

Yours, truly,

W. GASTON CAPEBTON,
General Manager.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 24, on page 43, and read as follows:

Bureau of War Risk Insurance: For expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as authorized by law: For salaries of the director and commissioners, and of such deputies, assistants, accountants, experts, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, \$9,509,630; stationery and minor office supplies, \$150,000; miscellaneous expenses, including telephones, telegrams, freight, express, foreign postage, not exceeding \$100 for street car fares, and not exceeding \$500 for law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$25,000; printing and binding, to be done at the Government Printing Office, and necessary printing of forms, etc., for use abroad may be done abroad, \$125,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, \$175,000; traveling expenses (exclusive of field investigations), \$5,000; salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigations and expenses of not more than eight temporary branch offices, \$1,000,000; in all, \$10,989,630: *Provided*, That all employees appropriated for by this paragraph shall be engaged exclusively on the work of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that I never noticed when the bill was under consideration by the committee the item in line 13, on page 44, "exclusive of field investigation," \$5,000 for traveling expenses. I thought all travel allowances were for field investigations. This is new, is it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will have to look into the matter. I will say to the Senator I do not remember whether it was carried in last year's bill or not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not a copy of last year's bill before me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will find it in a minute. I am inclined to think that this is a reappropriation.

Mr. WARREN. If it were in the last bill it would be noted in the committee print, would it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that that is the current law; it is the customary language.

Mr. SMOOT. I have just turned to the committee print and I see that those words were used in the last year's appropriation bill. I see it was put in by the House and I will not object to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill whether he is satisfied with the wording of the provision, beginning on line 9, page 44, which reads:

Printing and binding, to be done at the Government Printing Office, and necessary printing of forms, etc., for use abroad may be done abroad, \$125,000.

It does not seem to me that that conveys a clear intention. It provides that the work shall be done at the Government Printing Office and then that it may be done abroad if for use abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is a general law that all printing of that class shall be done at the Government Printing Office. There is an exception made in this particular case where it is impossible to do it at the Government Printing Office. I think that is all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would it not be necessary, then, to separate the items and provide specifically for printing abroad?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This language has been carried in the bill, as it is now, for some years and never has given any trouble. We have operated under it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill with reference to line 15. It reads:

Salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigations and expenses of not more than eight temporary branch offices, \$1,000,000.

Where are these temporary branch offices? What are they for? Why are they temporary?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator will pardon me for just a moment. If I can turn to the hearing I can give more full information. My understanding is that there were certain temporary offices to aid in the expedition of the work of classification and investigation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Where were they located?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not read all the hearing, but this will give an idea. The Senator will find the same matter was discussed by Mr. Brown, who was then acting chief of this bureau, and Mr. Nesbit, on page 1019 of the hearings before the House committee. This throws light on it. It is stated on page 1020 by Mr. Nesbit:

At least 40,000 allotments and allowances are paid to people in foreign countries—15,000 in Italy, 2,500 in Greece, and in 15 or 16 other foreign countries. These cases all require investigation.

These outside offices were established for the purpose of investigating the validity of the claims for allowances.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those offices are really in other countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding is that some of them are in the United States; that not all of them are in foreign countries, but a part are in foreign countries and a part in this country. It is to facilitate the question of investigation as to whether the allotments were valid and not fraudulent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suppose that they were considered necessary during the exigencies of the war, and when we get down to a normal basis they are expected to be done away with.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose when the war is over and we get down to a normal basis a very large proportion of the machinery of this office and the expensive work will be abolished, although the office itself will be a permanent office in the future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and there will be a very large force too.

Mr. President, I simply want to say that, as the Senator understands, when this bill was brought out of the subcommittee it was put through the full committee very speedily, and some of us at work elsewhere did not have an opportunity to go over the bill very fully when it was reported from the subcommittee. While I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations I did not have an opportunity to participate very much in the consideration of the bill. As I said, it was called up and hurried through, and my recollection is in the afternoon when the Senate was in session. There were some matters I had to look after and I could not be there. If I ask questions about some of the items that is the reason why.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am only too glad to give any information that I can in reference to this bill. I am only too glad to have the attention of the Senate directed to the bill. This bill takes care of the salaries of all the executive departments of the Government and it would be very hard for the Government to run without it. We have been in session to-day for over six hours. We have read one page of the bill. At this rate I think we will get through probably a dozen pages before the 4th of March, but as long as the time is occupied in the consideration of the bill I have no objection at all.

Mr. President, I am going to move for an executive session for a few minutes, as one of the Senators desires to refer a nomination. That will take only a minute. Then I wish to announce when that is over I intend to move that the Senate take an adjournment until 11 o'clock to-morrow, but I want to ask the Senate as far as this particular bill is concerned, if it is possible, to let us get down to-morrow and really consider the bill, because I think it really would be a reflection on the Senate if we finally scrapped these great supply bills without a reasonable effort to pass them.

In the last analysis, Mr. President, the principal business to which Congress should direct its efforts is to pass the revenue bills to raise the money to run the Government and to pass the supply bills that will take care of the machinery and operations of the Government; and very little along that line has been done at this session of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to

the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15835. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 20, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the brave men who answered the call of the colors when the world was imperiled, and those who braved the dangers of the ocean, who did their work and did it well, and are now returning to the land they love, with new laurels added to the American soldier, with Old Glory upheld and sustained through the perilous fight—her stars and stripes still streaming o'er us with added luster.

Some are coming back strong and well, others sick and wounded. Some are left where they fell on the field of carnage.

May those who come back have a warm welcome and be held in sacred memory by all true lovers of liberty.

God grant that the principles they fought for may live and be a blessing to mankind. Grant that the dead may live in our memory, the wounded be ours to care for. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARNHART, for one day, on account of illness.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS OF MR. SLOAN.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address by Hon. CHARLES H. SLOAN, of Nebraska, on the life and character of Lincoln before the Grand Army of the Republic, the Woman's Relief Corps, and other patriotic organizations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] on Lincoln's Birthday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. JOUETT SHOUSE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the appointment of my colleague, Hon. JOUETT SHOUSE, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks leave to print in the RECORD a speech about his colleague, Mr. SHOUSE, becoming Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 3646. An act to grant rights of way over Government lands for dam and reservoir purposes, for the conservation and storage of water to be used by the city of San Diego, Cal., and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to Francis Asbury; and

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing that one term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. JONES of Washington as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from consideration of House resolution 562, calling upon the President for certain information in accordance with section 12 of the shipping act approved September 7, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up the resolution, and it will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to report to the House of Representatives for its information all the facts within the knowledge of the United States Shipping Board, as required to be reported by section 12 of the act entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, including the recommendations made by the United States Shipping Board relating to seamen's wages, equalization of the higher cost, if any, of building ships in American yards, and the method or policy adopted for operating American ships in competition with foreign-owned ships, whether by the United States Government or by private corporations or individual American citizens; also full information as to the plans which have been adopted for providing stations for furnishing fuel for United States vessels in all parts of the world.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order that the resolution is not privileged. What committee has the resolution been referred to?

Mr. MANN. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It strikes me from hearing it read that it calls for a question of policy. Of course I have not seen a copy of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I will give the gentleman a copy. The gentleman's impression is a very natural one, from listening to the reading of the resolution; but what the resolution calls for is a statement of fact as to recommendations which have been made by the Shipping Board as to certain subjects. That is purely a question of fact.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that I was merely reserving the point of order until I could read the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Certainly, I understand; but what it calls for is recommendations, among other things, which have been made as to equalization of costs, the payment of seamen's wages, and the policy to be pursued, so it does not call for any conclusions.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I see now that it does not call for any explanations, but merely for facts.

Mr. MANN. It calls for recommendations which have already been made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withdraw the point of order. The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

RETENTION OF UNIFORMS BY SOLDIERS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 13366, known as the bill for the retention of uniforms by the soldiers, be laid before the House, and that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.